DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 787 HE 002 886

AUTHOR Magill, Samuel H., Ed.
TITLE The Contribution of the Church-Related College to the Public Good.
INSTITUTION Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 118p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Church Related Colleges; *Higher Education; *Private Colleges; *Religious Education

ABSTRACT

From the earliest years of its existence, the Association of American Colleges has been concerned with the place of the church-related college in American society. The reason for this is simply the conviction that something very important would be lost in the total spectrum of higher education should these colleges pass out of existence. The growing movement toward secularization in the 50's and 60's, however, has given rise to uncertainty in many quarters as to the distinctiveness of the church-related college. Moreover, many have raised the question of whether these institutions serve the public good at all. It was with these questions in mind that the Association's Commission on Religion in Higher Education decided to hold a conference on the contribution of the church-related college to the public good. Faculty, students, administrators, trustees, and church-board executives were invited to attend the conference, and approximately 50 persons convened for the 2-day session. This document contains the program of the conference and the issues discussed. Although the issues were not finally resolved by the conference, it is felt that a greater understanding of the alternatives for church-related higher education has been achieved. (HS)

ED 060787

# THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE TO THE PUBLIC GOOD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 886

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
Washington, D.C.

# The Contribution of the CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE to the PUBLIC GOOD

Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference
on the Contribution of the Church-Related College
to the Public Good, December 8–10, 1969

Edited by
Samuel H. Magill

**ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES**
**Washington, D.C.**
**1970**

# Foreword

From the earliest years of its existence the Association of American Colleges has been concerned with the place of the church-related college in American society. Although the fact that such institutions were instrumental in founding the Association might serve to explain that concern, there is a more fundamental reason why the Association has continued to examine the role of these institutions and to support their continuing viability. That reason is simply the conviction that something very important would be lost in the total spectrum of American higher education were they to pass out of existence: that is, the religious values which gave rise to the tradition of liberal learning in this country.

The growing movement toward secularization in the fifties and sixties, however, encouraged both by segments of the academic and ecclesiastical world, have given rise to uncertainty and confusion in many quarters as to the distinctiveness and uniqueness of the church-related college. Moreover, many have raised the question whether, in fact, these institutions serve the public good and whether it is in the public interest to continue to encourage the relationship between college and church.

It was with these questions in mind that the Association's Commission on Religion in Higher Education decided to hold a conference on The Contribution of the Church-Related College to the Public Good. The Commission believed that persons from a wide spectrum of the church-related college community and the churches should be involved in an examination of the issue. It was decided, therefore, to invite faculty, students, administrators, trustees, church board executives, and a few other interested persons to participate.

With the generous cooperation of The Johnson Foundation of Racine, Wisconsin, the conference was held at Wingspread, the Foundation's conference center in Racine, on December 8–10, 1969. Approximately fifty persons convened for the two-day session. A major research paper was prepared on the historical background of the issue by Dr. Charles E. Peterson, Jr., Associate Professor of Education at Ohio University. Other papers were contributed by Dr. Joseph P. Kelly of Webster College, Dr. Charles S. McCoy of the Pacific School of Religion, and Dr. Wesley A. Hotchkiss of the United Church of Christ. These papers, and the responses by friendly critics, are reproduced in this little volume in the hope that they will enable a wider audience to share in the examination of the issues which absorbed the conferees.

Although the issues were not finally resolved by the conference at Wingspread, it is our conviction that light has been shed on them and that we have been moved forward substantially in our understanding of the alternatives for church-related higher education.

Frederic W. Ness
President

# CONTENTS


PAGE

Introductory Remarks . . . . . 1
William Graham Cole

The Church-Related College: Whence Before Whether . . 3
Charles E. Peterson, Jr.

Commentary:
Harry E. Smith . . . . . 42
Charles E. Ford . . . . . 45

The Church-Related College in American Society . . . 48
Charles S. McCoy

Commentary:
Sr. Mary Griffin, B.V.M. . . . . 65

Secularization–Public Trust: The Development of Catholic Higher Education in the United States . . . 70
Joseph P. Kelly

Commentary:
William G. Guindon, S.J. . . . . 86

Neo-Monachism: A Coming Role for Church-Related Higher Education . . . . . 90
Wesley A. Hotchkiss

Commentary:
Harold H. Viehman . . . . . 99

Summary Statement . . . . . 104
Alfred F. Horrigan

Conference Participants . . . . . 110

# Introductory Remarks

**William Graham Cole**

I've observed on other occasions that as one looks at the spectrum of American higher education we find that there are four fairly easily distinguishable bands. At the one extreme is the totally secular institution. Some of the public colleges and universities are banned by law from taking any public position with respect to religious values or religious commitment of any sort, any attachment or affiliation with any ecclesiastical body. They are totally and completely secular. On the other extreme there is what one might refer to as the parochial school, the parochial college, which sees as its particular function not only carrying on the educational process but also makes no bones about the fact that it is in business to convert its students to a particular stance, a particular posture, of faith and commitment and to a relationship with an ecclesiastical body. Moving in one band from the right one comes to what might be called the Christian coilege. This is an institution which does not necessarily have any relationship with a particular church body, and yet nonetheless maintains a certain Christian ethos. It may or may not at one time have been affiliated with a church. Princeton was founded under Presbyterian auspices. Smith or Williams, on the other hand, although they came out of the Congregationalist tradition in New England, never were associated in any official or formal way with any church body, and yet these institutions do maintain a chapel; they employ a chaplain;–there is a certain Christian ethos about them, a certain commitment in the larger sense to the Judeo-Christian tradition. And then as one moves in one band from the other side one comes to the church-related college which shares with the Christian college and the secular institution a primary commitment to education as its task, but shares with the parochial institution an affiliation with a particular denomination. It is proud of the heritage which lies in its past.

Now the movement on this spectrum across the last three hundred and thirty-three years since Harvard was founded in 1636, the movement on this spectrum has been all in the direction of secularization. The day, obviously, of the founding of

new church institutions is pretty well over. Many of the older church institutions are moving either to become Christian colleges or becoming totally secular and the question which of course confronts all of us today is whether this is a good or a bad thing; for other institutions it may prove to be a bad thing. The purpose of this consultation is to try to discuss some of the issues that are involved here. To what extent is it to the public good that church-related institutions go out of business and become either Christian institutions in the broader sense or go totally secular? To what extent is it in the public good to maintain the diversity which has always characterized American higher education in contrast to most of the European countries, for example?

It was against the background of this question that this consultation was planned by the Commission starting well over a year ago. We thought it would be worthwhile, not only for the participants, but for some light which hopefully would be shed, beyond the narrow group of people gathered here, in the realm of church-related higher education and in the realm of higher education at large. So we hope to look at this against the background of the historical situation, looking at institutions which have gone one route or the other, and we hope to consider quite seriously the position of those who think this will be a great loss to the public good if the church-related institution disappears and to consider with equal seriousness the point of view of those who believe that it would be a great gain. I am hopeful that with the leadership we have here that this is going to be a very fruitful time not only for us, but hopefully will be of some use for the higher educational community at large.

# The Church Related College: Whence Before Whither*

Charles E. Peterson, Jr.

It is provocative, not to say paradoxical, to be concerned with the history of the church-related college in the age of the "now" generation. In many of its aspects the current world of higher education is anti-historical. "Tell it like it *is,*" we say, not like it *was.* I take it that no extensive justification of an historical approach to the problem of "The Church-Related College and the Public Good" is necessary; it is the sense that we are both the inheritors and the victims of our past as church-related institutions that brings us together at all.

What service do we require of history? Most of us would disallow Henry Ford's contention that history is "bunk," but would we be more receptive to this interpretation of the past:

> . . . the church-related college has stood historically against the very factors which have gnawed at the foundations of great civilizations and brought great countries to their knees.
>
> The church-related colleges have stood and will stand as the legions of historians, legislators, and educators continue to pass by. They will fail when democracy itself fails–when it is wrong to work hard, to make a profit, to accept responsibility, to be philanthropic, to pray, to determine right from wrong, to be concerned for one's fellowman, and to challenge.[1]

I suspect we would shrink back from embracing either extreme, neither claiming that history has shown us to be the seat of all virtue and the salvation of the republic, nor discarding institutional reminiscences as worthless.

The fall-out of history comes to have more significance if seen in the light of the Maryland case where one college of four was judged to be free of church relatedness to the degree that financial aid might be secured. The so-called Connecticut case

*In the interests of readability I have attempted to document sparingly, though the topic suggests a much more complete annotation.

[1]Brown, Robert W., writing in the Methodist publication *Trustee,* March 1969.

involving four Roman Catholic institutions is still pending, but the same issues of historic and present sectarianism are at stake.

The recent New York legislation commonly known as the Bundy law provides one more evidence of current legislative thought on an institution's historic fealty to its sponsoring denomination. The principle here is significant for future action between church and state. But the financial grants made directly to the fifty-two initially-certified institutions are not themselves inconsequential, especially if projected and capitalized as the income from endowment at present rates of return. The message can not have failed to reach the thirty-three institutions whose applications are still under scrutiny in terms of freedom from sectarian control.

Eligibility for such aid did not escape the notice of the trustees of Hartwick College in Oneonta when a formal request was made for severance of the historic affiliation with the local synods and the national body of the Lutheran Church in America. Founded in 1928, Hartwick had no formal ties with the denomination, though relations were close and cordial: the first presidents were Lutheran clergymen; courses in religion had a Protestant, if not Lutheran, flavor; and many Lutheran young people attended the institution in the past forty years, though probably not in the same numbers as found in some other colleges under the same sponsorship. The fact that the synodical contribution to Hartwick's 1968 budget was 1.17% of operating costs may have been as influential in the friendly separation as the fact that less than one in five of the Hartwick students is currently of Lutheran persuasion.

The point needs no laboring. Financial stress is only one reason for the examination of the past in search of an understanding of the present. It may have been the failure to construct from the past an operational and philosophical stance that caused an institution like Canterbury College in Indiana to close after five years of failing to secure support or understanding from either its denominational sponsor or from its local constituency.[2]

---

[2]Beeler, Kent D., *Canterbury College, 1946-1952: Its Decline and Demise* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1969).

And it is the search for a modern defensible posture for the church-related college which has sparked position papers prepared by such denominational representatives as Edgar Carlson, Wesley Hotchkiss, Arthur Ben Chitty, Myron Wicke, and others. We do need such self-conscious sorties into our past to "think out loud" about the nature of church-college relationship, to determine for ourselves whether we blend in with, or fight against, the stream of American higher education as it is now flowing.

To talk about the history of the church-related college is not easy, as many of my correspondents in the course of the preparation of this paper pointed out to me sympathetically. There is no such thing as *the* church-related college, first of all. Over forty church bodies sponsor colleges in this country and at least a dozen institutions have joint sponsorship. Within the college family of any one denomination there are wide divergences in size, nature of control, quality of educational program, students, and facilities. If the Christian college is in fact only a special case of the community of educational concern within the liberal arts tradition, it is still an instance which defies historical delineation with precision.

The situation is made more difficult by the vagaries of language. Terms such as "college," "university," "denomination," "church," "sect," "secular," "sacred," "theology"–even "education"–have not only an historical slipperiness but contemporary looseness which can only complicate and muddy discussion. But we have no better tools at hand.

Again, the mines of church-relatedness have been worked unevenly. For instance, our knowledge of the church-related college in the antebellum period is much more extensive than in the period after 1860. Tewksbury's oft-quoted study[3] surveys the college-founding mania of the period before 1860; a similar study seems not to exist for the last half of the century and very little has been written in the history of the church college in the early years of the present century. Limbert's survey of denom-

[3]Tewksbury, Donald G., *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932).

inational policies and support patterns for higher education[4] needs to be brought up to date in light of the church mergers and ecumenical progress of the last forty years. Though the age of the filiopietistic institutional history may be passing, even a recently-published college history drew from a reviewer the judgment: "Statements like these can but leave the reader in anguish." Frederick Rudolph is probably right in pointing out the nonsense purveyed about the church-related college in the absence of hard facts.

In the midst of the chaos and confusion a theme suggests itself. It derives in part from the attempt of the court in the Maryland case to assess the "flavor" of an educational institution. More particularly, it stems from the thesis established recently in the Holmes Lectures at the Harvard Law School delivered by Professor Alexander M. Bickel of the Yale Law School.[5] Professor Bickel has suggested a means of viewing the current activities of the Supreme Court which has promise for our understanding of the history of the church-related college.

The Supreme Court, according to Professor Bickel, has always been guided by an inner vision which has seldom been articulated to the public but which has nonetheless provided the focus for the decisions which the court has reached in the public's interest. The vision centered around the America of the future and originally was characterized by judicial concern for the sanctity of property. In more recent years the decisions have supported the idea of the egalitarian society. The court has been certain that, however acrimonious the debate at the point of its decisions, history will eventually vindicate the actions as fulfilling the inner vision.

Unfortunately, says Professor Bickel, the court has tended to be inflexibly idealistic about the projection of its vision into decisions. It has failed to take into account the changing nature of American society and the fact that even the best decisions in

---

[4]Limbert, Paul M., *Denominational Policies in the Support and Supervision of Higher Education* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1929).

[5]*New York Times*, October 10, 1969.

terms of pure jurisprudence may risk public rejection if the findings of the court run counter to or ignore the experiences which are shaping the society. Thus, to the judicial mind constrained to uphold the neatness of the idealist decision, the modifications (flaws, if you will) of experience sacrifices the beauty of the law. To the public whom justice is to serve, the modifications of reality make the findings of the law tolerable and indeed workable. Imperfection works to the common good.

Professor Bickel's thesis is suggestive of a theme which helps to interpret the historical development of the church-related college.

The inner vision of what the college might be was never entirely delineated, but it found expression in the thrust of the nation toward the creation of an America which was the Protestant variant of the Christian tradition. In the course of unfolding the vision it was modified or flawed by a number of factors: denominational stance; circumstance of founding; patterns of financial support; and others which we see less clearly. The vision was substantially altered. The experience of the church college would not go unnoticed. The altered vision was traumatic for some, sacrilegious for others, and exhilarating for a few.

Professor Bickel holds that the court finds its real function in the attempt to adapt the absolutes of the law to the realities of the society served. I suggest that the church-related college finds its purpose in the acceptance of the modifications forced upon it in the creation of a more responsive, more humane institution. Further, I suggest that the real usefulness in the reconstruction of segments of the history of the church-related college lies not in catering to our antiquarian whims but rather through providing the sort of historical insight which will help us to turn historical processes to our advantage in the present and for the future. In the past, the colleges were retrospective rather than projective in relation to their experience; they were emotional rather than analytical in regard to their own institutional dynamics; they were reactive instead of responsive to the needs of their society and ours. With the help of history we may do better.

## Some Unquestioned Answers

*The Denominational Role*

A number of general histories of higher education[6] give the development of church-related higher education in more detail than I can muster here, assuming that the reader needs such rehearsing at all. We know, for instance, of the struggles of the colleges of the "covenantal period," ranging all the way from Henrico College in Virginia which found disfavor with the local Indians to Yale and Princeton, founded by those who looked askance at Harvard's erring ways.

We read of the "Great Awakenings" of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, with the growth of colleges spawned by the oratory and spirit of evangelism. We need no reminding that the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Dutch Reformed, Unitarians, and others with a legacy of an educated clergy and people were early in the field, often fighting the forces of the frontier for the establishment of learning and piety. We know that the church transformed the concept of Manifest Destiny into religious terms and pushed westward, this time with Methodists, Baptists, Disciples, Friends, and other latecomers to higher education hoping that evangelical fervor would make up for a tardy start.

We know further that, in spite of the growth of the public university with its vocationalism and seeming godlessness, the march of college building proceeded at a pace so that over eight hundred colleges were established between the Civil War and World War I. And this in a time when the scholarship of the church college was being tested by Darwinism and the creation of new fields of knowledge, and when institutional commitment to higher education was being tested against the concern of most denominations for the implications of the social gospel. We know that in recent years colleges have come to be the prized possessions of churches which only lately have been convinced of the

---

[6]See, for instance, Brubacher, John S. and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition,* second edition (New York: Harper and Row, 1968); and Rudolph, Frederick, *The American College and University* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962).

value of higher education: Churches of Christ, Assemblies of God, Church of the Nazarene, and the various Pentecostal groups.

Denominational stance and policy have been important in the growth of the church-related college, though the evidence suggests that such corporate influence has been considerably less than is commonly believed. Albea Godbold[7] provides us with a useful measure for assessing the "strength" of a denominational body for initiating and supporting colleges. Real strength requires, according to Godbold, (1) a conviction among the leaders of the body about the importance of education; (2) a sufficiently large membership to successfully underwrite higher education; (3) a denominational organization which can encompass higher education; and, (4) wealth enough for the task. Where there was a marked deficiency of one or more of the factors, the chances of success in college founding and maintenance were substantially reduced.

Thus, we can see that the Episcopalians historically believed in education, but were sufficiently short on other factors that their colleges never equalled in numbers or enrollment those of other major denominations. The Presbyterians, on the other hand, scored well on all four criteria with the result that college founding and support moved apace with the growth of the denomination. While Godbold's criteria have quite obvious deficiencies (how else to account for the remarkable denominational support of some of the recently formed small denominations?) they are suggestive of the importance of a brief glance at denominational positions on at least two of these criteria, numbers one and three.

It is true that the preparation for the ministry loomed large in the minds of sponsoring groups. William and Mary was to furnish its colony and church with a "seminary of Ministers of the Gospel" to educate the youth in good manners and to propagate the faith among the Indians "to the glory of Almighty God." Yale was dedicated to the task of "upholding and propagating of the Christian Protestant Religion." Davidson, founded in 1838, was concerned that "the great and leading object shall be

---

[7]Godbold, Albea, *The Church College of the Old South* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1944).

the education of young men to the gospel ministry." Pacific University, a product of Congregationalist missionary activity in the West, opened its doors in 1854 "chiefly to acquire and perpetuate a strong religious influence by educating those who will become ministers and missionaries of the Cross."

Before we place too heavy an emphasis on the "pre-seminary" role of the denominational colleges, it is well to remember that after Yale fulfilled its propagational mission it was committed to instruction in the arts and sciences so that the students "may be fitted for Publick employment both in Church and Civil State." Proficiency in the learned languages and the liberal arts and sciences was the basic objective at Princeton; the ministry is mentioned scarcely at all. The Methodists, following the admonition of Wesley to "unite the two so long disjoined, knowledge and vital piety," established Cokesbury College with the promise of

> forming the minds of the youth, through divine aid, to wisdom and holiness; by instilling into their tender minds the principles of true religion, speculative, experimental, and practical, and training them in the ancient way, that they may be rational Scriptural Christians. [8]

It seems clear that Asbury had the vision of founding colleges, not to serve the interests of Methodism alone, but rather to act as beneficent agencies for all of society.

Through the history of the church-related college it appears that most denominational statements have been broad enough to encompass far-ranging educational activities. Where such policies have been parochialized–and they undoubtedly have been–it seems often to have been the response of the local college and its administrators. Surely the statement of purpose of Luther College which appeared in English for the first time in the catalogue of 1883:

> The institution owes its origin to the growing demand for educated men who could preach the Word of Life to the rapidly increasing Norwegian population of the country.
>
> The chief object of the College is to meet this demand, but it also

[8]Gross, John O., *Methodist Beginnings in Higher Education* (Nashville: Board of Education, The Methodist Church, 1959), p. 18.

> aims to afford the advantages of a liberal education to any youth desiring to avail himself of the same.[9]

despite its ethnic obligation, is not far in its inherent breadth from the statement from the catalogue statement of a few years back from Eastern Nazarene College:

> At Eastern Nazarene College we seek, in each member of our community, to enlighten the mind, to enhance the quality of personality, to enkindle a never-ending search for truth, and to enable each, out of Christian love and concern, to serve mankind creatively and responsibly.[10]

In short, with regrettable lapses into denominational self-pride, the motivations of church-related colleges as put forth by national bodies and by institutional founders have been sufficiently broad to permit a quality education within the framework of liberal arts, growing vocationalism, and church service. When this has not been the outcome, local factors and personalities may well be suspect.

Akin to the denominational thinking on the purpose of colleges was the matter of the usefulness of education and the range of men to whom its benefits ought to be extended. The church with a tradition of an educated ministry had no particular trouble with this as President James Walker of Harvard indicated in stating that the college "must make the obvious distinction between Christianity considered as a means of enlightening and civilizing men in their relations to each other and the world and Christianity considered as a means of eternal salvation to individuals." Both of these he felt worthy and legitimate functions of the church-related college.

It did not come as easily to the Methodists, whose *Book of Discipline* in 1784 held that "gaining knowledge is a good thing, but saving souls is better." By the time the Methodists recognized the shortsightedness of their attitude toward a learned ministry and reversed their course in the 1830's, the seed had been well sown. Peter Cartwright, speaking from the Illinois frontier, was

---

[9]Nelson, David T., *Luther College 1861-1961* (Decorah, Iowa: Luther College Press, 1961), p. 143.

[10]Catalogue of Eastern Nazarene College, 1965-1966.

reflecting not denominational policy but local sentiment when he said:

> I do not wish to undervalue education, but really I have seen so many of these educated preachers who forcibly reminded me of lettuce growing under the shade of a peach tree, or like a gosling that had got the straddles by wading in the dew, that I turn away sick and faint.[11]

Cartwright was a vanishing breed; though individual evangelists might mourn the ways of the devil in learned men, the denomination's position did favor joining "knowledge and vital piety" in individuals and in institutions.

The Baptists, too, characteristic of the non-intellectual church bodies, did an about face on the value of education as the nineteenth century moved toward the twentieth. In 1784 the Kehukee Baptist Association in North Carolina resolved:

> Education is not essential to the qualifications of a gospel minister. It is a good thing in its place, and forms no objection to the character and qualifications of a minister. God calls a man to the knowledge of Christ in the pardon of sin, without human learning or with it, as seemeth good in His sight, and in like manner He calls a Christian to the gospel ministry. God is not dependent on human education in either case. If He has use for a learned man He calls him. He never calls a man and sends him to man to be qualified.[12]

By the time Jonathon Going was inaugurated as president of Denison in 1838, it was clear that a choice might have to be made under certain conditions: "With all my friendship for education and all my zeal for its promotion, give me morality though coupled with ignorance in preference to immorality connected with the highest intellectual attainments." The forced choice, however, was becoming more remote. At the century's end the Baptists were linked in cooperation with the Rockefeller millions in the building of the University of Chicago and any real doubt of the importance of learning vanished. They would undoubtedly have shared the zeal of the Roman Catholic institutions who were viewing the value of education in a new way—as a means of breaking out of the ghetto of immigrant low-culture to a more affluent

---

[11]Cartwright, Peter, *Autobiography* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), p. 64.

[12]Godbold, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

Americanism—of the Lutherans who were moving from instruction in the native tongue to classes taught entirely in English, and even of the fundamentalist church groups who in the early years of this century were concluding that the pursuit of education under the auspices of the church was not tantamount to a compromising of one's soul beyond redemption. With local aberrations, to be sure, the commitment of the denominations to education as a personal and corporate good was sure.

In one other area, control of the governing board, the role of the national denomination seems to have been more modest than the accumulated myth might suggest. There was the case of Luther College where, well into the 1930's, the regional synod maintained firm control of the institution, taking official cognizance of minute details of daily operation. Similarly, Elmhurst College [13] suffered under the close supervision of its sponsoring group until a new constitution was structured with the formation of the Evangelical and Reformed Church in the 1940's. Even then the church was initially unhappy that only three-quarters of the trustees needed church approval. In each case, the fortunes of the institution seemed to have picked up appreciably with the loosening of control, but they were more or less local strictures that needed relaxing.

Because of the strength of the denomination and the influence of Princeton, the Presbyterians came to dominate the life of their institutions—or thought they did. In 1831 a church spokesman claimed that the church had possession of a large majority of the colleges of the nation; twenty years later the claim was made more specific: two-thirds of the colleges were directly or indirectly under denominational control. But the local situation may have belied the national pride. In 1847 the Secretary of the Board of Education deplored the fact that the number of colleges under strictly Presbyterian control was so small and expressed the

[13] I am indebted to Wesley A. Hotchkiss for calling my attention to Elmhurst College as a church-related college which is in many ways typical of the evolving institution in relation to its sponsoring denomination. A recent history of Elmhurst is found in Denman, William F., *Elmhurst: Developmental Study of a Church-Related College* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1966).

hope that all institutions would commit themselves to the management of the church instead of to a "comparatively irresponsible body of self-perpetuating or state-elected trustees." The growing insistance on local autonomy was clearly enunciated for all Presbyterians to hear when President Patton addressed Princeton alumni in New York and issued his own declaration of independence: ". . . While I hold my place as the head of your alma mater I will do what in me lies to keep the hand of ecclesiasticism from resting on Princeton University." There were cheers from those assembled.[14]

Breadth of denominational outlook and control was the concern of the Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West, which throughout its twenty-five years of operation aided and saved many of the midwestern church colleges of today.[15] The 1858 annual report of the Society stated its position:

> The grand point to be attained . . . is that the charter of each institution aided by this Society shall be equally open for the election of the Trustees from either or all of the denominations concerned in its establishment; and that it shall be free from the organic control of any ecclesiastical body.[16]

The Society was apparently satisfied that its standard had been satisfied at such institutions as Wabash, Marietta, Beloit, Wittenberg, Oberlin, Heidelberg, and Ripon. The Society relied on both reports from the institutions and on observations from visiting teams to the colleges themselves.

As a matter of fact, the growing sectarian sharpness after the 1740's more than once worked to foster breadth in the boards since it became necessary to placate hostile factions through inclusion in governing bodies. Kings College, Anglican

---

[14]Wertenbaker, Thomas Jefferson, *Princeton 1746-1896* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1946).

[15]Peterson, Charles E. Jr., *Theron Baldwin and Higher Education in the Old Northwest* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1960). The Society's scrutiny of the control of member colleges was careful; aid was frequently withheld until a suitable broadening of control occurred.

[16]*Annual Report* of the Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West, 1858.

by birth, had on its first board ministers of four other denominations. Brown's board, though dominated by Baptists, included Congregationalists, Anglicans, and Quakers. Union College was founded in 1785 by Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Dutch Reformed working together. Its first charter stipulated that the majority of trustees should never be from one segment of Calvinism and that the president should not hold a pastorate while in office.

Oberlin evidenced an increasingly meaningful pattern in the mid-nineteenth century through its ties to Congregationalism, not through legal dependence–both polity and theology would have precluded that–but through the personal affiliations of the local leaders who came to influence the college's operations. This pattern of friendly association and low degree of denominational oversight sent into the current century a group of institutions well suited for new organizational forms which has outgrown narrow sectarianism on the local or national level. Other church bodies and college boards could hardly have been oblivious. Roman Catholic colleges were late to heed the message, but this can be at least partially explained by their traditional reliance on the expertise of the priest in matters dealing with religious education, and in the growing sponsorship by the teaching orders of the church which as "self-perpetuating bodies with a natural disinclination to organizational harakiri [have] simply retained in their own hands control of the institutions they established." [17]

By the time denominational boards of education began to assume some responsibility for the supervision of the church's higher education affairs, it was too late to establish tight national control, even if this had been stated policy, which it was not. Hamilton had broken relations with the Presbyterians in 1893 and Wesleyan retracted its commitment to Methodism in 1907. The boards, consequently, were left with the functions of giving counsel to member institutions, attempting to raise academic standards (as the Methodists did through the University Senate), and studying and reporting on the state of higher education to the

[17]Hassenger, Robert, ed., *The Shape of Catholic Higher Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), pp. 30-32. The chapter by Philip Gleason is a particularly good short account of the growth of Catholic higher education in this country.

parent church. In time former Chancellor Tolley of Syracuse, referring to Methodist-related universities, could say regretfully, yet with pride: "ours is the last important group of Protestant church-related universities. Unhappily, it is not clear that they will remain Methodist related. They will be nonsectarian. They will be more and more institutions in the public service." [18]

The evidence suggests that the quest for nationally focused tight control of church colleges has almost always been futile; it simply moved against the stream of self-determination which has lately characterized the churches themselves. Where denominational repressiveness did exist—and it did—it was more the result of local parochialism and defensiveness than of national church policy. Edgar Carlson set forth a position which is both currently useful and historically informative when he wrote recently: "We have disavowed a view of the relation between the colleges and the churches which would permit viewing them as agencies of the church in preference for a covenant relationship in which each is recognized to have its own function but a common commitment and point of view on crucial concerns."[19]

That there have been instances of repressive denominational relations to colleges history amply shows. Yale, after all, did have to contend with Thomas Clap, hard-bitten and completely orthodox, who brought the young college to the brink of ruin through his insistent efforts to play off one denominational faction against another. And Horace Holley at Transylvania did run afoul of Presbyterian antagonism and resigned, with the result that the college fell eventually into Methodist hands. But in Holley's case, his difficulty was at least partially due to his habits of high living, his ensuing dispute with the governor, and with his personal leanings toward Unitarianism. Again, I would raise the question of national policy versus local circumstance.

---

[18]Tolley, William P., in "The President's Bulletin Board," publication of the Board of Education of the United Methodist Church, July-August, 1968.

[19]Carlson, Edgar M., *Church Sponsored Higher Education and the Lutheran Church in America* (New York: Board of College Education and Church Vocations, Lutheran Churches in America, n. d.), p. 62.

The case of Princeton may push the explanation further. Why did Princeton fall from its eminence under John Witherspoon, with its magnificent contribution of learned men to the new nation, to a point barely thirty years later which is described by its historian Wertenbaker as being its nadir? The conventional answer has been to blame the narrowness of Presbyterian polity and practice. And perhaps this is so. But it can also be seen as a localized sort of narrowness that saw the appointment of Ashbel Green as president at a time of great institutional need. Green, who in his own student days at Princeton was filled with sorrow that he was the only professing Christian in the student body, was totally incapable of meeting the college's needs for curricular reform, for a sane disciplinary policy, for better teaching, for fresh insights into the function of a college which Witherspoon had seen clearly. Clearly Green was aided, abetted, and directed by his trustees, a group scarcely more able to fathom the college's problems than himself. But they were Princeton's trustees first and foremost and their operation of the college reflected Presbyterianism not writ large, but writ exceeding small. The General Assembly could and did wring its hands over Princeton, but when the plan for a divinity school incorporated within the college came before it in 1808, the assembly decided not to tinker further with the college but to go the way of a separate seminary.[20]

I would hypothesize that the inner vision of the church-related college did become flawed, but that the flawing was the product of local circumstances primarily. I would hypothesize that denominational statements about college founding were surprisingly broad in their phrasing, that denominational recognition of the value of education preceded its acceptance in the farflung churches, that denominational stance toward institutional control was initially flexible, and though subjected to all the stresses of internal sectarian strife, moved steadily toward a lessening of contractual mental sets and the fostering of affiliational compacts—or even less formal ties. The evidence suggests, I think, that denominational leaders from quite early days recognized, for sometimes quite practical reasons, that extreme sectarianism was not likely

[20]Wertenbaker, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

to lead to eminence in higher education, either for denominational systems or for individual institutions. The major branches of Protestantism, at least, wanted to make a virtue of necessity as rapidly as possible.

Unquestionably the vision was imperfect. Where it was, I think that local factors can be isolated as readily as sweeping national issues. Where boards of trustees acted repressively, they did so as less than capable representatives of the best thinking of the denomination. Where presidents failed to measure up to their charge, as often as not they revealed themselves to be lesser men ill-suited to the administration of a system of education they only dimly understood. Where tests of academic freedom arose, they were sparked as often by bickering forces inside the college as by heretic-baiting denominational bigwigs. The flawing of the vision was, as often as not, a product of local geography, local church leaders, local politicians, local finances, local manias, and local believers, parents, and students.

*Circumstances of Founding and Growth*

That the patterns of early college founding were important needs no special pleading; we have all lived long enough with the burden—or heritage, if you prefer. Someone has suggested that the chief characteristics of the church-related college seen in the perspective of history are some of these: (1) primary constituency drawn from the denomination served; (2) courses in religion required for literate churchmanship; (3) required devotional services; (4) strong personal influence on the students by faculty; and (5) tradition of the preacher-president. Though these criteria have become increasingly unsatisfactory as the church college has evolved historically, they serve to remind us how many of the aspects of the life of the college were under the more or less immediate supervision of the college and its neighboring patrons. The influence of national denominational body, though effective in persuasion, was remote in terms of functional operation.

The Methodists gave early recognition to the impossibility of national supervision when in 1820 the General Conference called upon all the annual conferences to establish literary institutions within their borders. The conference, a local body, was given the

right to control the institution in such a manner as found possible. The local bishop was given the right to appoint traveling preachers to serve as officers and teachers in the colleges. [21]

The Presbyterians, a connectional church, went West with their Calvinist Congregational brethren to found colleges under the unstable Plan of Union of 1801. The Presbyterians were occupied with such matters as doctrinal orthodoxy and correctness of form while the Congregationalists turned their attention to theological liberalism and social reform. While Presbyterians were debating predestination and closed communion in the colleges, their partners in this unequal yoking were fighting the evils of liquor and slavery. For our purposes it is enough to notice that while Presbyterian aggressiveness won control of a number of colleges from the Congregationalists prior to the Union's breakup in 1852, it is the concept of the college operated by the latter which has come down to us as the optimal model of the associational, prophetic relationship between church and college. Rudolph points out that this denominational group, with the exception of the Baptists perhaps the least organized nationally, was unusually successful in founding nonsectarian colleges which came to the present ready to assume leadership in matters of curricular reform and altered church relationships. [22]

Baptist style represents a lower case congregationalism. They were a numerically large but scattered and decentralized church. By 1860 their one million members represented 3.5% of the population of the nation. Their single-minded concern with evangelism overcame their theological diversity to make them powers in the forming and nurturing of locally-focused colleges. In most instances, the college under Baptist aegis was really a college-community alliance, the community substituting in some ways for the absent national parent body. The result was not one of coordinated denominational movement to found colleges, but rather a haphazard series of essentially local ventures which had from the start a generous admixture of non-religious motivation. Even when state associations of Baptists were involved, an effort

---

[21] Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

[22] Rudolph, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-70.

was made to work out agreement with local forces for the support of the college.[23]

The Baptists were fractionated by Free Will adherents who broke off to found Hillsdale College, by Seventh Day Baptists who were active in the founding of Alfred University, and by the serious defection of the Disciples who were filled with zeal for the founding of colleges in the South, Midwest and West. Because of an insecure local base many of these institutions failed; national strength, had it been willing, was not up to the task of support.

Even a college like Kenyon, ostensibly the child of a church with a strong hierarchical bent, seems never to have had its institutional decisions made by the church as a whole. Typically these were local decisions, and even when in the late nineteenth century the bishops of the dioceses of Ohio contested for seats on the board of the college it was still a contest kept within the bounds of the state.

Denominational polity was one thing; geography and tactics were others. The fortuitous and often promotional nature of college founding is implied in the comments of one immigrant to Illinois who noted that "a settler could hardly encamp on the prairies but a college would spring up beside his wagon." Even when the church gave conscious thought to college founding, the outcome was often unpredictable. Francis Asbury seems to have had a knack for locating colleges in out-of-the way spots. He would have said that this was an attempt to protect the young students from the vices and temptations of the world; the result of unfortunate location was that all the colleges founded within the first thirty-five years of the Methodist Church's life came to nought. Similarly, Furman University tried three different locations in or near towns of 500 before coming to rest in the larger Greenville. Mercer and Wake Forest selected sites where there were no settlements at all, and Beloit, founded in 1845, was located 500 miles from a bank and three days' drive from the nearest city.

---

[23]Potts, David B., *Baptist Colleges in the Development of American Society 1812-1861* (unpublished doctoral dissertation Harvard University, 1967), p. 12. In addition to his treatment of Baptist institutions, Potts contributes considerable supporting evidence for the impact of "localism" on colleges of all denominations.

Both Philander Chase of Kenyon and Theron Baldwin, representing interdenominational interests, thought this isolation might be an advantage. Said Chase:

> Unless we can have some little means of educating our pious young men *here,* and here being secure of their affections, station them in the woods, and among our scattered people to gather in and nourish our wandering lambs, we have no reason to hope for a continuance of the Church in the west.[24]

Baldwin, whose efforts to aid struggling colleges were always based on local conditions of management and piety rather than in denominational connection, put it this way:

> It is one of the glories of American colleges, that they are not concentrated into one vast University, but scattered far and wide among the people; each one filling its sphere, availing itself of local associations and local sympathies, and standing up there as the visible and ever present representative of liberal and Christian learning.[25]

Some church colleges have through the years been able to turn location to an advantage. More often their enclave status as a protection from a secular culture has proved a handicap both to the college and to the supporting public. The result has been the historical creation of a false dichotomy which, false though it is, has had immense operational strength. Thus, cities and universities (especially the "new" university of the late nineteenth century) have come to represent progressivism, modernity, and "openness" to culture, while the rural and small church college has seemed to be the resort of the innocent and the stronghold of traditionalism in education. Even a college like Elmhurst, founded in 1871 in the suburbs of Chicago, seems to have been unable until quite recently to fully capitalize on its sub-urban location, seemingly the best of both possible worlds. In Elmhurst's case the proximity to the city was relied upon chiefly for a supply of commuting students in hard times and as a fringe benefit for recruiting faculty.[26]

---

[24]Smythe, George Franklin, *Kenyon College: Its First Century* (New Haven: for Kenyon College by the Yale University Press, 1924). p. 16.

[25]Tewksbury, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[26]Denman, *op. cit.*, p. 539ff.

The same tendency toward defensiveness and isolation in the Catholic college was reinforced by the many exhortative references by Protestants to the twin menaces of the mid-nineteenth century and later, infidelity and Roman Catholicism. Although this was often embedded in the rhetoric of Manifest Destiny, there could be no doubt that wariness, even hostility, was the correct response to the institutions of the immigrant church. "The majestic West must be educated," said one writer. "If Christianity does not do it through her literary institutions, Infidelity will." Lyman Beecher spoke for many Protestants when he exulted, "To plant Christianity in the West is as grand an undertaking as it was to plant it in the Roman Empire, with unspeakably greater permanence and power." [27]

The localized college foundings led to unbridled competition for students, for money, and for public support through the churches. By 1840 the nine Revolutionary colleges had grown to more than one hundred. Amherst and Williams contended for New England's support; Western Reserve and Oberlin sought Congregational favor in Ohio; Washington vied with Jefferson in Pennsylvania; and the numerous rivalries of sectarian colleges in Tennessee and Kentucky defy counting. In some areas public and private institutions were seen as complementary, not competing; sectarian squabbling foiled the chances for long-range alliances. In 1829, for instance, the Methodists launched an attack on Indiana College charging that the president and faculty were Easterners and Presbyterians, and, worst of all, opposed to Andrew Jackson. They demanded their share of the college's limited professorships, citing their denominational strength in the locality. The upshot was the withdrawal of any state support from the college for forty years. [28]

Abner W. Clopton, agent for Columbian College (later George Washington University) probably typified the narrowness and competitiveness of the church-related colleges, though he and others of his time would prefer to have seen it as denominational

---

[27]Tewksbury, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-74.

[28]Schmidt, George P., *The Old Time College President* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), pp. 38-39.

fidelity. He deplored the lack of Baptist colleges with the resulting pressure on Baptist families to send their sons to other denominational colleges. Numbers of these young men, he said, "have returned home under the influence of strong anti-baptist prejudice–confirmed in anti-baptist principles."

American colleges were definitely institutions of the local community. Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale were products of their local provinces; their aim was not to supply a continental stock of educated men, but to provide well for their own regions and hope that the nation's interests would be served by other colleges doing the same. The maintenance of a local and religious stance was not easy, however. Many of the church colleges were rent by anti-slavery disputes, anti-Catholic machinations, and growing sectional distrust. Struggling for support they were the targets of those who would broaden their scope, perhaps make them into public institutions or at least statewide agencies of education under denominational control. In a number of instances the actual removal of the institution to a more favorable location was proposed. Such plans brought the inevitable confrontation between denomination and community.

The outcome of the removal disputes was predictable. Seldom was an institution picked up bodily and transplanted, but the decision to remain in place often carried with it some concession to a wider definition of religious affiliation. Thus, Denison began to think of itself as an Ohio Baptist college. In 1856 Bucknell's supporters argued that the university was designed, not simply for the immediate neighborhood, for "*The Baptists of Pennsylvania as a Denomination.*"[29] Even so, in most states there was competition for the support of the denomination with the result that whatever the concessions made to the church, the practical support had to come from a region less than statewide in size.

The very American mixture of local and denominational forces in permanently located rural colleges undoubtedly created an anomaly in our national cultural development. It fostered strong local sentiment and patronage for the church-related

[29]Potts, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

college and more than occasionally a proprietary interest which was to prove restrictive. On the more positive side, it created institutions which saw themselves as the functional base of the total system of higher education and it created through its focus on the activities and fortunes of the college on the local hilltop a growing public sentiment in favor of education at all levels. The church colleges benefitted as much as did the public institutions from this broad base of public sentiment. Indeed, deprived of the public's interest in and tolerance for the local denominationally related college, we would have no occasion to discuss that institution's part in the public good.

*The Role of Financial Support*

It is clear that there has been an historically close relationship between control and support of church-related colleges on the one hand and the programs and purposes of these colleges on the other. Identification with the denomination seems to have been a financially pragmatic thing for many institutions, forcing the college to do what was needed for survival without undue reference to national policy and purpose. Colleges failed because at the same time their constituencies, local, state or national, were withholding adequate financial support, they were also imposing restraints which made it difficult for institutions to seek other sources of aid. In some cases the withholding of support was the result of disapproval of the program and emphasis of the college; in others it seems to have been the flagging of parent denomination support for higher education itself, at least in competition with other claims for church benefactions. Whatever the reason, undue restrictions drove off supporters and killed some institutions. Ironically, within a matter of months a public institution had often taken its place. [30]

It is picturesque, if more than a little sad, to view the financial history of the church-related college as being summed up in the account of how Julian Sturtevant, the longsuffering president of Illinois College, fed his large family on bread crumbs

[30]Kinnison, William A., "Toward Maturity in Christian Higher Education," *Liberal Education,* vol. LV, no. 2, May 1969, p. 320.

dipped in molasses following the panic of 1837. But it would be equally unrealistic to overlook the church college's traditional susceptibility to the ups and downs of the American scene. They were affected by the economic slumps of 1837, 1857, 1887, and 1929. Wars, too, took their toll. Many colleges did not survive the Civil War, though relatively few of them were physically destroyed. Marshall College in Georgia and Cherokee Baptist College, founded by Georgia Baptists in 1853 and 1854 respectively, never reopened once the war was concluded. A stronger institution like Wake Forest was forced to close for a time after 1862 and many northern institutions were put in desperate straits because of declining enrollments.

Aid, when it came, was often in pitifully small amounts. Donations to Mercer in the 1830's included 40½ bushels of corn, four pairs of socks, 2¼ gallons of vinegar, and an empty barrel. At a somewhat later period, a subscription of fifty cents to Bucknell's $100,000 endowment fund had to be paid in installments of 12½ cents.[31] Very few institutions could count themselves as fortunate as Howard College in Alabama which sought and found the favor of General E. D. King, a local planter. In his own simi-literate way the General was speaking to the proprietary interest which often accompanied even small gifts when he said: "Money are power and I are got it."

In the closing years of the century in particular, national church groups sensed the plight of their collegiate children and tried to build the base of aid beyond the local or regional level. Before 1900 six of the major denominational groups had formed agencies for the support and supervision of higher education, but even this aid at first was directed to worthy individuals rather than to institutions. The presidents of the church colleges welcomed the interest of the denomination but felt certain that their own efforts had to be continued. It was simply too risky to depend on financial support at the national level which was slow in building and which lacked the tug of sentimental tie to a particular favored local institution. In the period of 1886-87 when

[31]Potts, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

faculty salaries were often three to four months in arrears, President Larsen of Luther College took matters into his own hands, as he had done so frequently before, and wrote five hundred letters to ministers and laymen of the region setting forth the college's plight. The response was gratifying. Most institutions accepted gratefully what aid the national denomination could offer, realizing full well that with the increase of colleges under the sponsorship of the denomination available aid would be divided in more directions.

Within the last fifty years most of the major denominations with systems of consequence in higher education have established national agencies for aid and counsel. But fundamental problems have not been solved—probably have not been met, really. New patterns were emerging, for instance. By the middle of the 1920's the amount of aid, though still increasing in absolute terms, had begun to shrink in terms of its relation to total budgets of the aided colleges. At the same time some of the traditional pacesetters in denominational support were overtaken by newcomers to higher education. The Congregationalists, long leaders in the field, sank to a relatively low position and their place began to be taken by new groups such as the Norwegian Lutherans, the Disciples, and the Baptists. The problem of declining aid is well illustrated in recent figures from the Lutheran Church in America. Denominational support for the church's colleges increased 102% from 1956-57 to 1966-67. In the same period, however, increased financial aid given by the colleges (up 378% in the same period) had more than eaten up the increase, even allowing for some measure of federal underwriting. [32]

Elmhurst College again makes a good instance of the basic problem. Under close scrutiny and control by a denomination which was consistently unable to match its interest with dollars, Elmhurst was gradually forced to seek other means of support. It was especially hard hit by the depression of the thirties. There was a general moratorium on wage increases in that period and in 1932 the first of several wage cuts was instituted, later to reach

[32]Carlson, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

the level of 25%. An endowment drive in the same period produced something like $31,000 for operating funds in the years 1930-1933.

In 1935 the parent church announced that it could not guarantee *any* church support for the college. This prompted some talk of severing the connections with the sponsor, and the president, probably uttering the thoughts of an increasing number of college administrators, challenged the church: "Labor with us to provide adequate funds for the college to maintain its accreditation or cast off the college permitting it to secure funds independently wherever possible . . ." No action was taken on this proposal, though the church did reshape its boards through the series of denominational mergers to take account of some of the problems of the local colleges. Elmhurst, and others like it, struggled through the declining enrollments of the early fifties, its insecurities heightened by the lack of pattern of centralized giving which would be incorporated as a part of the Congregationalist contribution to the forming of the United Church of Christ. [33]

Financial aid problems in the church-related colleges have carried several characteristics which are of some importance in accounting for the continuing process of severing the cord, psychologically at least, between denomination and college. One of these characteristics was that appeals for aid were from the first necessarily phrased in broad terms, though aimed at defined audiences. In 1830 the Presbyterians of Indiana, for example, were asked to contribute twenty-five cents per person toward the $600 needed to fund a chair of theology for Hanover College. This was a state appeal rather than regional or national; even so only $100 was raised.

The Baptists recognized clearly that if they were to survive at all it would have to be because of broad local support; national organization was virtually absent. Thus, their agents sought general support, not simply from loyal Baptists. Franklin College's agent addressed his financial pleas to "The Patriot, the

---

[33]Denman, *op. cit.*, pp. 319, 492, 500-513.

Christian, and the lover of learning." An 1822 pamphlet was addressed to "the people of Maine" and made no mention of the word Baptist. The founders of Colby argued in surprisingly modern vein that the college, in addition to its service to private interests, was also an asset to the state through its low-cost education and its preparation of teachers for the public schools. In some cases non-Baptists were admitted to college boards with a resulting tension and friction, but with some significance for the breaking of denominational feelings of monopoly on individual colleges.[34]

A second characteristic lay in the tendency for denominations to link aid to colleges with the process of reform or reorganization of their educational systems. In the period from 1910-1920 the Presbyterians limited aid to those colleges which gave little promise for the future, chiefly because of poor location or excessive competition. In 1915 considerable progress had been reported toward the uniting of two colleges in Kentucky, toward securing unanimous support for one college in Oklahoma, toward a policy of concentration in Texas and Kansas, and toward the relocation of a college in Washington.[35]

The Methodist Church had "loudly called" for a "well-digested system of collegiate education" in the General Conference of 1840. That the system was slow in gaining effectiveness is indicated in the regret expressed in the "Plan of Federation of Methodist Institutions of Learning" issued by the secretary of the Board of Education in 1892. He deplored the fact that so few of the colleges founded by the denomination had become permanent and that a total of 142 had ceased to exist or had lost all Methodist relationship by 1884. The use of the word "federation" in the report's title may be suggestive of the denomination's increasing realization of its appropriate role in relation to its member colleges.[36] Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam confirmed this stance when he spoke in 1942 before the National Association

---

[34]Potts, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-26.

[35]Limbert, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

[36]Wicke, Myron F., *A Brief History of the University Senate of the Methodist Church* (Nashville: Board of Education of the Methodist Church, 1956), p. 6.

of Schools and Colleges of the Methodist Church:

> Is it possible, and, if possible, is it desirable to work for sufficient coordination of Methodist educational efforts to justify the term "Methodist" plan or purpose in education? I do not say "Methodist system." The term "system" suggests a rigidity or strait-jacketing not in the mind of the Commission.[37]

The Bishop went on to outline how through collaboration the goals of Methodism and quality education might be realized.

The plight of Wesleyan University may suggest why local colleges felt compelled to go beyond the denomination for aid. At the close of the Civil War, Wesleyan was in precarious circumstances. Enrollment had fallen from 150 students to 121. The college chose not to attempt to attract new and broader public support but turned to the Methodist Church for aid. By 1868 the papers were full of messages to Methodists in Connecticut saying that "the honor of our Church imperatively demands" additional support. In 1870 the college went counter to the trend of the times and to the wishes of the founders in changing its charter to bring the college under denominational control. Forgotten temporarily were the words of Wesleyan's first president Wilbur Fisk who in 1831 dedicated the college "not for mere sectarian purposes, but for purposes of general interest." The denomination could not respond in terms sufficient to solve the institution's problems and the relationship was permanently severed early in the present century.[38]

Still another characteristic of church-college support is the increasing breadth of vision brought to college patrons by the ecumenical thrust of recent times. With the possible exception of the fundamentalist colleges–and the generalization is weakening even there–the colleges were increasingly open to the spirit of ecumenicity and cooperation and this tended to weaken doctrinal and dollar ties with specific denominational positions and with supporting church patronage. Similarly, the patron to whom the

---

[37]Wicke, Myron F., *The Methodist Church and Higher Education 1939-1964* (Nashville: The Board of Education of the Methodist Church, 1965), p. 16.

[38]Peterson, George E., *The New England College in the Age of the University* (Amherst: Amherst College Press, 1964), p. 54ff.

college could have appealed in former years was increasingly being wooed by causes other than educational, and with considerable success. Arthur Ben Chitty analyzes it this way, speaking of Episcopal colleges:

> Failures of over two dozen colleges reflect a variety of causes, among them being a general lack of church organization which prohibited budgeted support; a non-authoritarian church government which prevented action by edict; and strangely enough a peculiar virtue characteristic of Episcopalians. It is this. The broadly educated Episcopalian has wide ranging interests and his philanthropies go far beyond his church and church colleges. He is not a parochial giver. Thus the very qualities which have made him a public spirited citizen have acted against the interests of his own colleges.[39]

The crucial test of church-college ties came, of course, with the Carnegie Foundation's attempts early in this century to provide a means of pension for faculty members in higher education.[40] Coming on the heels of the exodus of clerical trustees from the church colleges, with the eclipse of authoritarian norms of administrative behavior, and with the evisceration of the overly-pious classical curriculum, the 1906 proposal caught the church-related colleges at perhaps their greatest moment of weakness and stress in intradenominational relations. The foundation was able to label only fifty-one colleges as being completely nondenominational while more than two hundred others appeared to be more or less owned outright by some church or denominational group. The Foundation did not exclude colleges merely "in sympathy" with a church, but it was clear that the Foundation's real sympathies and monies were likely to go to the college having no difficulty in presenting itself as independent of church control and influence.

The result was predictably immediate. The Presbyterian Board of Christian Education sought to help its affiliates by publishing in effect two lists of colleges depending on closeness of

---

[39]Chitty, Arthur Ben, "Episcopal Colleges: The Quick and the Dead," (manuscript of an address originally delivered in 1947).

[40]It is tempting to speculate upon the effect of the Bundy law and similar legislation upon the denominational ties of those colleges which survived the ordeal of Carnegie temptation with relationships intact. Is there likely to be a second great institutional soul-searching and, if so, with what outcome?

relation. The trustees of Dickinson College took matters into their own hands, declaring the college to be non-sectarian, though under the friendly auspices of the Methodist Church. The trustees of Goucher declared the college to be "an independent and non-sectarian institution free from denominational control, supervision, affiliation or patronage." Bowdoin gave up a lucrative sectarian endowment to seek coverage by the Foundation. Within four years twenty college qualified for aid from the Foundation; after that the institution was required to participate in the pension plan on a matching basis and enthusiasm cooled noticeably. This in itself is a gauge of the sensitivity of the church-related college to the source from which its support can be most readily anticipated. The college has operated historically from a quite pragmatic base. It has been forced to do so.

Several hundred colleges remained sectarian under the pressure from the Carnegie money, but, according to Hofstadter and Metzger, they were "marginal institutions, financially, educationally, intellectually."[41] More important than the structural modifications necessary to qualify for Carnegie sanction were the re-evaluations of denominational relationship which took place on many campuses. When the Foundation questioned the colleges about whether church relationship improved the organization of the college, the response was almost entirely negative. In few institutions was the relationship considered an active good; rather it seemed to be something to be endured. To questions put by the Foundation most colleges replied that church connection played little if any part in the intellectual or religious life of the student body.[42] The responses, if nothing else, revealed the poverty of the relationship at that time. They also revealed the hope that a modus operandi could be devised which would be more satisfactory to each of the partners in the changing relationship. The church college has never felt the financial relationship (and all that financial support implied in program and purpose)

---

[41] Hofstadter, Richard and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 363.

[42] *Ibid.*, pp. 361–363.

with its denominational sponsor to be totally adequate or functional; it is likewise clear that it has been the brave college which took the steps which would choke off this modest support entirely.

## Some Unanswered Questions

To this point I have been suggesting that the vision of the church-related college—seldom completely articulated as an operational guide—has been modified through the years by such factors as denominational polity and attitude; by forces of geography, control, and public favor; and by the financial arrangements which provided the pragmatic matrix of the college's affiliation with its sponsoring denomination. Further, I have suggested that these forces which shaped the vision were much more localized and specific than we have been willing to recognize. When the Congregationalists and Presbyterians struggled for the control of colleges like Wabash, Ripon, Illinois, and Marietta, it was essentially a local affair involving overly-zealous proponents of the two denominations acting in their capacities as individuals. Similarly, when the Methodists established multiple colleges in Iowa and the Presbyterians did the same in Missouri, it was as often as not a representation of local and regional aggressiveness which may have had doubtful support from the parent denomination.

I think these are important factors to keep in mind as we attempt to assess the historical background from which the college's relation to the public good derives. But there are at least three unanswered questions of an historical nature which demand examination before the true dimensions of the relationship can be outlined. In each of these questions I will be able to sketch only the bare outlines of the concern. In each of the question areas much historical searching and study are needed before the full picture will be revealed. Each of these, in its own way, fleshes out the image which the nation as a whole has of the church college, and, consequently, of its right and capacity to fill a significant role in a total system of higher education for the nation.

*The Image of Church-Related Narrowness*

A number of historians have argued that debate about the nature and curricular content of the church-related college is basically pointless. These colleges obviously prepared students for careers other than the ministry; they obviously had curricula which were drawn from the twin ideological streams of Athens and Jerusalem. But still fresh in my mind are the memories of a dean of a church college who felt himself constantly dealing with the stereotypical obstacle of the church-related college's image as perceived by the young faculty recruits he was trying to woo and win. The image was especially strong and especially grotesque among those who had never attended a church-related college. Their misimpression is much like that of the population as a whole, I would guess. The colleges are seen as dull in teaching, nonexistent in research, and tenacious in adherence to outworn moral codes. This, too, is part of our present.

We simply do not know enough about our heritage in this respect. One might quote from Cotton Mather's *Magnalia* in support of an early recognition of the breadth of purpose and program: "In the perusal of this Catalogue, it will be found that, besides a supply of MINISTERS for our churches from this Happy *Seminary,* we have hence had supply of *Magistrates,* as well as *Physicians,* and other *Gentlemen,* to serve the Commonwealth with their Capacities." The "Happy Seminary," Harvard, was soon outdone by Columbia whose first president Samuel Johnson presided over a curriculum that included bookkeeping, geography, and navigation, clear evidence of a new expansion of interest in keeping with a new nation.

Unfortunately for us, the image of the church-related college has been shaped not so much by the "Happy Seminary" of Mather's day, by Johnson's Columbia, or even by liberal Harvard under Eliot, but by the spirit of the Yale Report of 1828 and by the support given it by Noah Porter and James McCosh. We have been a long time freeing ourselves of the legacy of Yale, "the mother of colleges." Have we succeeded?

Or, we might point out that Harvard's first graduating class contained less than half ministers, casting some doubt on the

hopes of *New England's First Fruits.* Four graduates of the class of 1642 became clergymen, two became physicians, one a physician-minister-teacher, one a British diplomat, and one is unaccounted for. We know also that up to 1850 only about 25% of the graduates of Harvard, Yale, and Dartmouth had entered the ministry; at Davidson the equivalent figure was 30% and at Randolph-Macon prior to the Civil War the percentage was twenty. But is our image also shaped, wrongly to be sure, by the fact that Luther College had only four of its twenty-six graduates fail to enter the ministry during its first ten years, and that as late as the second decade of this century it was said that half of all graduates of Hampden-Sydney became clergymen?[43]

Are we more likely to be identified in the mind of the public with the old-time president who typically received his training in the ministry and his administrative apprenticeship in a boys' academy, or with the new president who was university trained, often abroad, and who saw himself as an academic specialist? Are we more likely to have our colleges linked with the old time president–narrow, rigid, ascetic, evangelical–or with the new president portrayed as urbane, generous, statesmanlike, endowed with a large sense of humor–and the possessor of a new rational unemotional religion? The picture is confused.[44]

Finally, are we as able to present the church-related college historically as the outpost of freedom of thought and the locus of personal growth for students–or does our history emphasize the witness of parents of a Wofford College student expressed in a letter to the faculty: "We felt that if we could obtain the means of sending him to Wofford, God would convert him." They found the college's chief advantage to lie in "its wonderful success in initiating our sons into the highest science–the consciousness of God reconciled in his soul, and in the training of their spirits for heaven."

Though the quotation is nearly eighty years old, the catalogue statement of Central College, Fayette, Missouri in 1891

---

[43]Nelson, *op. cit.*, p. 97; Godbold, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

[44]Peterson, George E., *op. cit.*, pp. 138-139.

may give a more current popular appraisal of the church-related college than we care to admit:

> Take care not to send those who are most near and dear to you to schools in which the Christian religion is openly attacked, or even ignored, lest while their intellects are being developed and furnished, the foundations of their religious life should be rudely torn up and the darkness and desolation of skepticism take the place of the light and comfort of the faith you have taught them at home. See to it that the mother's religion, the father's faith, the sweet influences of the pious home, are not discredited by the "philosophy, falsely so called," of the arrogant professor. Put your son into the care and keeping of Christian teachers, if you value his soul.[45]

We simply do not know enough about the fallout from the limited, sectarian defensiveness expressed in this statement. We need to know more.

*The Image of Educational Isolation*

Another area which needs historical explication is the notion that in recent years the church-related college has been separated from the maincurrent of higher education and has necessarily become a backwater of curricular stodginess. By the last quarter of the nineteenth century the church college had come a long way from that day in 1817 when Allegheny's founders had been able to address the assembled townspeople in the classical tongues and had received a response in kind. The Morrill Act in 1862 had provided an acceptable and attractive alternative to the church-related college and even the pious seemed determined that their children should get both a practical and humane education, in all probability in the new institution. The college had been above all a Christian manufacture; the university of Gilman, Eliot, Harper, White and Jordan surely had no interest in sectarianism and little time, it sometimes appeared, for religion itself. Increasingly, the zeal that had gone into evangelistic efforts on the campus was now redirected to matters of scholarship in the new disciplines.

An 1895 graduate of Oberlin sensed this change: "Really the old Oberlin is passing away. That is all right, if only the old spirit of self-sacrifice can be maintained. It distresses me that

---

[45]Butts, R. Freeman, *The College Charts Its Course* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939), p. 224.

the educational part in our colleges is not more thoroughly permeated with the Christian spirit, and education is looked upon so much as an end in itself." The Oberlin trustees responded a year later by stating that Oberlin, an "avowedly Christian college" from its beginning, still intended

> to lay a practical daily emphasis on the ethical and spiritual in education—on life and faith, and at the same time to allow the fullest freedom of thinking within the broadest Christian lines. The College . . . believes in a loyalty to Christian truth that should manifest itself in a persistent and earnest application of that truth to the life of the world.[46]

Oberlin might bridge the gap between the old and the new in education with positive results for its institutional reputation; other church-related colleges were not so fortunate. Many of the denominational colleges entered this century in a state of evident decline and their efforts for the next fifty years centered around organization for self-protection and sharing of limited resources and morale. They sought support for a narrowly defined concept of religion in higher education and seemed unable to break out of the marginal educational status into which fidelity to the faith, as they perceived it, had placed them. The Catholic colleges, growing in numbers and holding tightly to the tradition of the liberal arts, seemed for many the appropriate backdrop against which to evaluate the 1920 book of addresses published by John Henry McCracken, then president of Lafayette. This spokesman for church-relatedness confirmed the suspicions of many when he argued for the right of the denominational college to remain free to be educationally one-sided, to ignore whole fields of knowledge if it desired, to pick and choose its students and faculty carefully, and to remain small with emphases on religion and the training of leaders. [47]

---

[46] Barnard, John, *From Evangelicalism to Progressivism at Oberlin College 1866-1917* (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1969), p. 103. Although not totally successful in its interpretation, the Barnard study indicates the need for other institutional research studies in the ferment-filled post-Civil War period. Oberlin's evolution as an institution was not typical of most of the hundreds of church-related colleges in the nation. Among other things, it moved toward the secularization of its curriculum with more speed and insight than other colleges could muster.

[47] Butts, *op. cit.*, p. 392. Significantly for our purposes, the title of MacCracken's work was *College and Commonwealth.*

The church-related college had lost a major skirmish, of course, with its generally anti-intellectual response to the publication of the *Origin of Species* in 1859. The question of the incompatibility of science and true religion was resolved through a series of acrimonious public tangles between the new man of the laboratory and the representative of the older faith. Almost always the former won; the latter retired to lick his spiritual wounds, to attempt a reconstruction of his theology, and to convince the public that the decline of religion in the colleges was the direct result of curricular specialization. President Wishart of Wooster might try to reconcile the two forces by including in his chapel talks the principles of the new evolution and the new physics of Rutherford, Heisenberg, and Jeans, but the public was more inclined to see the church college's need to be dragged kicking and screaming into the modern world.[48]

Individual faculty members could make personal adaptations to the new scholarship by taking up the social gospel or by joining with colleagues from public institutions in the formation of the American Economic Association, the American Sociological Society, and other disciplinary groups.[49] Institutions were more likely to respond by changing the old "Evidences of Christianity" to the more contemporary English Bible course. Even more helpful from an institutional standpoint was the adoption of what George Peterson has called the "Whole Man" idea. This was a stance better suited to the talents and resources of the smaller college and one which could be defended on rhetorical rather than empirical grounds.

The Reverend William A. Stearns had anticipated the need for this doctrine when he spoke at the Amherst inaugural in 1854:

> The end or aim of education . . . is not primarily to produce greatness in partial directions, great mathematicians, great philologists, great philosophers, but in the best sense of the term, great men–symmetrically and powerfully developed.[50]

---

[48]Barnes, Sherman B., "Learning and Piety in Ohio Colleges," *Ohio Historical Quarterly*, July, 1961, p. 233.

[49]Littell, Franklin H., *From State Church to Pluralism* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 95–97.

[50]Peterson, George E., *op. cit.*, p. 31.

Under this thesis character replaced piety as the ultimate ideal of education. Christianity became merely one of many complementary parts in the Whole Man's makeup. Gone was the harsh Puritanism and in its place came something of the gentility of the Gilded Age. Colleges still believed it was possible to produce Christian gentlemen, but this was quite different from their earlier claims to the production of Christians.[51]

From the college's standpoint, this "Whole Man" theory was broad enough to cover a good bit of collegiate anti-intellectualism while simultaneously buying time which the college sorely needed to think through its purpose in a new world. Insofar as it was understood, the concept was vapid enough to contrast badly in the public eye with the demonstrable outcomes of non-religious and vocational education at public institutions. Too often, the outcome of the church-related college appeared to be an education of "balanced mediocrity and sophisticated purposelessness."[52]

Do we really know enough about the church-related college's response to changing education conditions to fit our history into our present circumstance? I think not. We need to know much more about the church college's role in and reaction to the development of independent study, to the Liberal Arts Movement of the thirties, to increasing curricular flexibility. Has the private college's traditional claim to innovative leadership been preempted by the public institution? Our record might be better than we think.

*The Image of Confused Secularization*

Finally, we need to have much more historical evidence to clear up the confusion which exists among the colleges and their publics about the meaning of terms like "secularism" and "secularization." To refer to a college's going through the process of secularization may call to the public mind (and to some colleges, too) the idea of fewer students entering the ministry, or the abandonment of compulsory chapel, or the sort of evidence that

---

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

came out of Oberlin in 1911. In that year the Committee on Student Life and Work asked students to rank the possible goals of college life in order of importance. Men ranked "development of mental powers" first, while for women "acquisition of general culture" headed the list. Far down the order came "development of religious life"; it was ranked sixth for men and eighth for women in a field of eleven.[53]

But this is not what Harry E. Smith has in mind in his book *Secularization and the University*.[54] For Smith, secularization is a liberating force for higher education, freeing the institution to examine all facets of its world in the light of a God-centered theology and to take responsibility for personal and institutional stewardship in all areas of man's existence. Smith structures his ethos for the Christian institution primarily on the writings of contemporary theologians; we need to search more diligently for historical antecedents which will inform this aspect of our query as the writings of Gogarten and Bonhoeffer have done theologically for Smith's interpretation of the mission of church-related higher education.

We need to know, for instance, if the tendency of the church-related college to loosen its church ties in recent years has a parallel in the feelings of many individuals that they get along very well in life quite outside the dimensions of conventional institutionalized religion. What can history tell us? Or what can we discover about theology's becoming a more private affair at the very time when the theologically-based college is called upon to play a more public role? What does history indicate of the fate of the church-related institution in a society which finds formal theology more and more meaningless, a subject fit primarily for professional theologians?[55]

It seems to me that the recent history of Catholic colleges may be instructive here. If I read this history correctly, I see

---

[53]Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

[54]Smith, Harry E., *Secularization and the University* (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1968).

[55]Kinnison, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

a group of institutions which have lately come to the realization that secularization in the Smith sense is good and that there be no need for "Catholic" versions of disciplinary study. Out of this have come some very interesting efforts at self-appraisal and increasing questions about what the Catholic institution ought to be. Whatever the problems that have faced Catholic education in the past, there was traditionally little doubt that the institution had a reason for being. Now such doubt exists and is acknowledged. [56] We would profit, I think, from an examination of the history of a college about which its president said recently: "Mundelein is needed specially in this post-conciliar era—to be open to what Pope John called signs of the times, to question, interpret, experiment, to stand as a witness to the relevance of spiritual values in our material world."

## Conclusion

I have attempted to say that the inner vision of the church-related college, like the inner vision of the Supreme Court, has been discerned more clearly in the evolutions of the colleges and universities under the control of the church than it has been through carefully worked out enunciations of principle. But there has been a vision, however ineptly articulated, which has guided men and institutions down to the present time in higher education. Further, like the inner vision of the court about the future America, the vision of church-related higher education has been modified by design and by chance, by geography and by custom, by bigness of vision and by smallness of spirit in the lives of individuals. Through these modifications the vision has been adapted to the realities of our lives and to the wishes of the people, just as the court's vision has been and is being modified by daily events and by public acceptance and rejection. It matters little how ill-guided the modifications have been; the vision did bend and become flexible and living—and that is important.

It is important, too, that we not approach the discussion of "The Church-Related College and the Public Good" with a

[56] Hassenger, *op. cit.*, pp. 51–52.

*mea culpa* complex born of the painful examination of the factors of our history as institutions. It is entirely possible that the church college and its parish counterpart could not have matured other than they did, evolving as they were as spiritual institutions in an increasingly materialistic society.[57] It is entirely possible, I think, that the very modifications which we commonly think of as flaws in the vision of the church-related college hold the key to the future role of the institution in service to its world. The very responsiveness to local pressures hints at an institution which cares and which has the machinery to make care concrete. Its susceptibility to the thinking, even the pressures, of local personalities suggests that its strength lies in service to men in individual situations. Its penchant for piety and missionary commitment hints at its capacity for inspiring young people to lives of service to their world. Our historical flaws may reveal the secret of our future mission.

I assume that this is part of the question that brings us together at this conference.

---

[57] I am indebted to Professor Wilson Smith of the University of California at Davis for calling this idea to my attention.

# Commentary

**Harry E. Smith**

Let me begin by expressing appreciation for Ned Peterson's paper. He has done us all a service by demonstrating how to "make self-conscious sorties into our past" in order to learn from it in the present and future. Where most of us selectively use history to provide illustrations of our biases, he seems actually to ask *whence?* in such a way that it precedes and informs *whither?* Although at times the terms he uses in reference to history sound a bit repressive–talk of being *victims* of our past (p. 3), references to the *burden* of the past (p. 18), *"painful"* examinations of our history (p. 41), and the *fall-out* from history (p. 3)–the overall impression is a much more creative appropriation of our history, as what has happened is pressed for its deeper meaning and its significance for us today.

I was struck by the helpful analogy with the Supreme Court's rulings in his introduction, the suggestion that as "history eventually vindicates the rulings of the Court as fulfilling its *inner vision* in particular circumstances" (p. 6), so the reconstruction of the history of church colleges can enable one to accept with more grace the modifications which have been forced upon them. He suggests that we can thus alter expectations without destroying the inner vision and thus accept the disparity between the inner vision and actual situation in church related higher education. My uneasiness with this analogy comes at two points. First, the inner vision of church colleges has never been as clearly and decisively articulated, it seems to me, in principle or practice, as has the inner vision of the Supreme Court, in its repeated rulings. Even its minority opinions are clearly stated. As Ned Peterson notes, there has never been unanimity among the church colleges. True, there have been catalogue descriptions and denominational statements of purpose–broadly defined motivations and goals. But I do not feel the same certainty Ned does about the substance of that inner vision "which has guided men and institutions down to the present time in higher education."

A second question about the analogy stems from a suspicion that it may represent a tendency, albeit disclaimed, to accom-

modate to, to make a "virtue of necessity" (p. 18). I'm nervous about blurring the difference between the normative and the descriptive, between goals and actualities; baptizing circumstances as "God's will," which runs contrary to the emphasis of the rest of the paper upon assuming responsibility for shaping our future, rather than passively being shaped by our past.

Most helpful of all, I felt, were the last two sections. The discussion of *unquestioned answers* lists some of the factors which help to explain the disparity between inner vision (whatever that is!) and actuality in church colleges. In this section, however, I could not help feeling Peterson has some unexplained need to acquit the national denominational boards and to fix the blame upon the local leaders, geographical locations, and circumstances for flawing this inner vision. "Localism" is repeatedly blamed for inflexibility, narrowness, and defensiveness, not just in the colleges of denominations with congregations or decentralized polities, in Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Lutheran (ALC) colleges as well. Although national advisory boards and executives have often seemed to be more enlightened, open, and flexible than many local Boards of Trustees, or even some college administrators, I'm not sure that the polarization he implies between denominational and local leadership is that sharp, or that a denomination's posture in higher education can be assessed apart from the practices of its particular colleges. Perhaps I'm just a nominalist at this point.

Finally, I'd like to comment on Ned's *unanswered questions* of an historical nature, what he calls "historical flaws which may reveal the secret of our future mission" (p. 41). The three prevailing images he describes are surely very widely held, e.g. narrowness, educational isolation, and mixed assessments of secularization. Yet these images, which are readily justified from our several histories, are being challenged as some church colleges discover new ways to assert their distinctiveness. As one who works with an organization which is made up of faculty, administrators, chaplains, and graduate students in state, private, and church colleges and universities, I am increasingly impressed that some of the most exciting innovations which are taking place in teaching methods, calendar revisions, curriculum, and governance,

are to be found in the church colleges. You know the kinds of things I mean, e.g., Earlham's Program II for freshmen and sophomores, Davidson's "Blue Sky Report" which led to a complete revision of the curriculum, Maryville's All-College Council, New College, Sarasota, Project REAL, Florida Presbyterian College's early development of the January short-term for independent study, St. Olaf's Paracollege, Redland's Johnston College, etc.

If physical isolation, required chapel services, and tenacious adherence to certain moral codes are no longer the distinguishing marks of church colleges, as Peterson points out, then there must be greater clarity and self-consciousness about what is to be their distinctive contribution to American higher education in the future, and whether their distinctiveness requires official relationships to a denomination. Perhaps it is just here, in their freedom to pioneer and experiment with new styles of teaching and learning based upon an understanding of truth and persons rooted in Biblical faith, that church colleges can develop different reward systems for faculty, improved learning environments, and new patterns of community governance. We need to hear more about the church colleges' experiences here, Peterson rightfully asserts, and we need to ask whether this kind of leadership in the common good can best be provided by colleges under or independent of denominational control. Only thus can church colleges move into the next decade marching to a different beat than the lock-step cadence of forced professionalism and depersonalized education which is becoming increasingly depressing to faculty and students alike.

## Commentary

**Charles E. Ford**

As a historian of American higher education, I have no quarrel with the essential thrust of Ned Peterson's paper. When I reflected on this assignment, I wondered why I was asked to respond. Was it because I waa a historian and had studied 19th century American higher education, specifically the history of science and had gone through college after college that had systematically turned away from its great potential (I'm speaking of the small Protestant colleges.), and in so doing provided the rest of higher education, Stanford, Washington, Chicago, Harvard, Michigan State with the great scholars who, in fact, did the work of American science in the 19th century. In that sense, his three central points certainly corroborates my study of 19th century science. But I don't think I was asked to comment from the dimension of an historian of American higher education. I suspect it's because I'm involved in the work of the Center for Christian Higher Education and have also studied and written on Catholic higher education. In this sense then, I would offer two or three minor *caveats.*

My first reaction to Ned's paper was in algebraic terms: Church-related equals Protestant; history equals the 18th and 19th Centuries. I think this reflects a general characteristic of American historians of higher education. Many are romantics who prefer to focus on that golden era of 100 years ago when Eliot became President of Harvard and the great post Civil War boom in higher education began to gather speed. The study of this era is still very dramatic and interesting, but not particularly helpful to us in the responsibility we have at this conference. I think if there is any great serious shortcoming–and I don't want to fault Ned on this because he has executed his assignment with depth and style–but if we are to understand the dimensions of our problem, the value and future of church-related colleges, we need to look at the history of American higher education through at least the middle of this century. No one, however, seems to be willing to analyze the first half of our century. Edward Power has conducted a thorough study of the history of Catholic higher education but stumbled when he came to our own century. And

we all seem to stumble. I don't think we will get anywhere in understanding our problems until we thoroughly grasp what has happened since 1900. We must make special efforts to understand the impact of two major wars and the depression for a thorough understanding of church-related colleges and the history of Catholic higher education. Note that I have said nothing about the events of the past five or six years, the seeds of which will undoubtedly alter our whole concept of higher education.

Now let me move over as a historian and speak as an analyst of Catholic higher education. First of all, if we are to look at the problem in proper perspective, it must be defined as Christians involved in higher education. Now that demands a great deal of us and so far I haven't seen enough to give me complete confidence that we will look at the problem in these terms. I think we tend to speak of Presbyterian higher education and of Lutheran higher education and within Catholic higher education, we tend to look at Dominican, Franciscan, and Jesuit higher education, etc. I wish that at least for the sake of this conference, we might be concerned as Christians examining problems of higher education. I hope we broaden our base away from simply discussing the church-related college. Now Sam Magill can object and bring us right back to the topic of church-related colleges, but I contend we do ourselves a disservice if we take this tack, but back to Ned's paper and Christian higher education.

Everything Ned said about the shortcomings of Protestant colleges obtains for Catholic higher education and, quite frankly, I can throw in another half a dozen or more points in the disability area. Some of the older Catholic-oriented educators present can speak to that point more competently than I. They would, I am sure, describe some disabilities that might cause all of us to be pessimistic about our ability to grasp the problems and move ahead toward solutions demanded by renewal.

My work places me on many college campuses and so I'm involved in the technical questions of renewal. I am sure that several of the key commentators will deal with the technical questions and I, of course, grant the broad sweep that Harry Smith has taken that Ned has pointed out in his paper, but we must also take into consideration that we have such simple ordinary facts

to deal with as structures of boards of trustees, financial management, administrative responsibility and concepts of curriculum development and of the other processes that constitute an academic institution.

In summary, what I want to suggest is that while we must face the broader questions which I know will be a part of this conference, the technical questions may defeat us before we get to the real issues that face us. In short, while Ned has presented us with an excellent paper our lack of vision has us in a trap which has not allowed us to understand the true condition of our institutions today, not only in terms of their Christian nature, their Catholic-Protestant relationships and understanding, but their very operations.

# The Church-Related College in American Society

Charles S. McCoy

Sweeping changes have been taking place within American higher education over the past century. In addition to enormous growth, democratization, expanding scope of studies, specialization, the development of fantastic power and technology, increasing importance of higher education in shaping society, and tremendous expansion of funding for research, there has also been a great educational tilt toward public colleges and universities and away from private and church-related higher education. This latter shift especially has resulted in widespread unease and anxiety about the colleges sponsored by churches. What roles and functions are appropriate to them in this age of the public college and federal-grant university? Do they have a future? Should the relation between church and college be severed? These are some of the questions around which the current unease and anxiety gather.

The concern is partly over quality, partly over the mounting difficulties encountered in financing all non-public colleges in a time of rapidly increasing educational costs, partly over what purposes church-related colleges ought to serve and in what directions they ought to move. In the face of the intense anxiety and, indeed, the problematic character of the entire relation of the churches to higher education, Merrimon Cuninggim's comment of a few years ago appears as a studied understatement: "Protestant efforts in higher education are in a state of considerable disrepair." Nor are Roman Catholic affairs in better condition.

The painful fact is that church-related higher education has been undergoing significant changes in its internal structure, in its constituencies, in its pattern of funding, in its relations with church agencies, and in the functions which it serves. But it is not clear that the necessary rethinking of its nature and purpose, based upon adequate policy research, has been going on in order to keep pace with the changes. As a result, despite encouraging signs here and there, it is not difficult to discover a pervasive

uncertainty which easily becomes opportunism, manifestations of drift which frequently indicate loss of direction and coherent policy, and a mounting anxiety which threatens failure of nerve on the part of college administrations and church agencies alike.

It is not my purpose here to comment on all the varied problems which plague denominational colleges. I shall explore a single question: What will be lost to American society and the churches if church-related colleges sever their denominational ties? Obviously only a sketchy response even to this one question can be provided here. My remarks are intended to accomplish three purposes: 1) to provide insight into where the church-related colleges are at present; 2) to clear the air about the function of higher education viewed in Christian faith; and 3) to state several important reasons for maintaining ties between churches and colleges.

Church-related colleges can, I am convinced, contribute to a richer mix of diversity and function in American higher education. But there is no guarantee that all colleges sponsored by churches are capable of meeting these challenges. In what follows, therefore, I offer no blanket endorsement of church-related institutions. If they will engage in rethinking their roles at the most basic level of commitment, purpose, and social context, church-related colleges can move toward new self-understanding which will continue to make them too important to lose.

It is pointless to speak of what would be lost if colleges and churches severed relationships unless we have some understanding of the current state of affairs and its possibilities. Much of the current confusion rests upon historical illusion which distorts the vision of the internal dynamics of church-related colleges. Higher education sponsored by churches has an important role to play in a pluralistic and diversified scene of American colleges, universities, and specialized institutes. But this role must emerge from what church-related colleges actually are, not from romantic visions as represented in histories by old grads and in college catalogues.

Additional misunderstanding arises from the quest for some unique function which only church-related colleges can perform because of the Christian faith which informs their life. The search

for uniqueness is probably pursuing a will o' the wisp, certainly is questionable on educational grounds, and appears to me as a perversion of Christian faith. This quest must be discarded before it is possible to see the contributions of church-related colleges which we can ill-afford to lose.

Franklin Littell has remarked that "the major problem before the churches in America is the achievement of self-understanding." An important part of such self-understanding is an adequate view of the past; and in few areas are Christians plagued by more misunderstanding than in regard to the history of American higher education.

It is often said that higher education in the United States is the child of religion. This is probably true of the British colonies if one means that the founders of the early colleges were also active churchmen and Christian believers and that they assumed their continuity with the learning of European Christendom. Brubacher and Rudy are correct in saying that "the Christian tradition was the foundation-stone of the intellectual structure which was brought to the new world." But it is often mistakenly assumed on the basis that the colonial colleges emerged from religious motivation that the church-related campus of today stands in direct continuity with the colonial heritage which provided the foundation for American higher education. This is not precisely the case.

The colleges of the colonial period were the product of a societal effort to serve the welfare of the whole community. They were not church colleges in an exclusive sense. Frederick Rudolph writes:

> Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale . . . were creatures as much of the state as of the established churches. . . . And whether they should be thought of as state colleges or as church colleges is a problem in semantics that is perhaps best resolved by calling them state-church colleges.

It would be better still to call them public Christian colleges in order to get away from the notion that institutional control by state and church prevailed. These colleges were established to serve the public interest as then conceived, to serve the common good, and to be involved with society and its problems by providing leaders.

Our present church-related colleges derive not from the colonial period but from the nineteenth century with its proliferation of sectarian colleges. Though it cannot be said of all church colleges founded in that century, most were founded to serve particular groups, to be what Jencks and Reisman call "special interest colleges." As the nineteenth century wore on, denominational colleges became increasingly defensive of sectarian viewpoints and doctrines. More and more they tended to protect and indoctrinate students in the faith and morals of a particular sect—the group, of course, which controlled the college and provided its leadership. To further protectionist purposes, the colleges were usually isolated from general societal influences.

Many college leaders today prefer to forget this past, or to interpret it through the exceptions which can be found, or through idealistic statements in charters, catalogues, and presidential addresses. These sources provide as inaccurate a picture of what was actually going on then as they do today. The colleges which survived the high mortality rate for the sectarian institutions, which proliferated without plan or control, are the church-related colleges of today. We shall lose more than we gain if we continue to obscure the past and its clues to the situation of church-sponsored higher education in the present.

Church-related colleges today find themselves in a difficult dilemma. They are caught between the remnants of their sectarian past and the demands of their public present. This dilemma has created a crisis of identity in most church colleges, a crisis which is a reflection of the uncertainty within the churches. On the one hand, there is a rush to repudiate the sectarian past without attempting to discover what in it may be worth building upon. On the other hand, there is a furious attempt to catch up with educational and technological change. Let's look at what we ought to drop and what we ought not to lose of this past.

One persistent echo of the sectarian past, the quest for uniqueness based upon Christian origins and sponsorship, usually arises more from pride than faith, more from concern for a good image than a desire to serve. It is sometimes phrased to promote snob appeal—the suggestion that church-related education produces *better* people, perhaps meaning more acculturated, white

Protestants and, by implication, more *successful* people. All in all, there is little reason to wonder at student rebellion against compulsory chapel and similar items on the college program. Students sense a contradiction between avowed Christian purpose and hidden goals of a less praiseworthy nature. They recognize that much of the college rulebook is aimed over their heads at parents, trustees, and influential publics.

Today there is much talk of the Church as servant. But servanthood is practiced all too seldom. Here, as elsewhere, there is a gap between the image projected and the operational reality—a credibility gap most apparent to students but visible to outsiders as well. I stated previously that the dilemma of the church college may be seen as its sectarian past versus a public present. The dilemma might be equally well stated as protectionist pride versus open servanthood. In this perspective, it becomes clear that the quest for uniqueness, beyond being illusory, may actually subvert Christian purposes. The more the church-related college strives for an ephemeral distinctiveness, the more it will be tempted to deny the claims of Christian faith upon it—claims which require policy research and action on behalf of a more humane society.

In the latter part of his *Church Dogmatics,* Karl Barth talks about the meaning of the Christian community as it exists within the world. Rather than following the usual view which sees church and world as opposing entities, Barth holds that the Christian community knows itself through Jesus Christ to be in solidarity with the world and responsible for humanity. Pride leads us to affirm a chasm between church and world. Christian faith confesses our solidarity with the world and our responsibility for it.

Christian faith, I am convinced, leads the church-related college not to seek for an isolated uniqueness of function but rather to move toward solidarity with man and society, raising such questions as: *What is the common good?* and *How can we contribute to it?* The "common good" may be variously interpreted, and Christians should be contributing by specific actions and programs, rather than in a supposedly splendid isolation or in claims to special wisdom and goodness present only in church-related colleges.

Such a change of view, from pride to servanthood, from uniqueness to solidarity, from the pursuit of isolation to pursuit of the common good, may lead to greater freedom and pioneering on the part of church-related colleges. And, if this occurs, we may see public and private higher education beginning to emulate the church college. Some notable examples of this kind of imaginative innovation in church-related colleges come to mind at the University of the Pacific, at Florida Presbyterian, at Iowa Wesleyan, at the College of Wooster, and at the University of Evansville. Happily, the examples are increasing.

The shift may also solve the dilemmas of church-related higher education which have produced a crisis of identity in many institutions. When a particular college asks how—with its energies, constituency, and resources—may it contribute to the common good, then it may move toward the discovery of significant identity and purpose. If the answer to this question is sought, not only by a committee made up of the president and a few trustees, but within the entire college community—with faculty, students, alumni, and persons from the constituencies served—then new energies and resources may be tapped and a wider sense of community and purpose may come into being.

The way toward deeper faithfulness to our Christian heritage is to move beyond the residual images of the sectarian past with its quest for uniqueness, and seek ways toward greater solidarity with the society around and within the campus community. And a resolution of the crisis of identity requires study and action aimed at serving the public good.

At no point does the dilemma of the church-related college appear more sharply than when one considers the consequences of mounting support for higher education from state and federal governments. Some time during the nineteenth century, the United States embarked upon what must be called a "great experiment" in universal education. This experiment has proved to be of far-reaching significance for American society and for global culture. Our technological power and political dominance, as well as our tragic immaturity in world affairs, can in large measure be traced to this development.

It must be called the Great Experiment because no society in the short history of mankind had attempted it before. Previously, education beyond the most elementary levels had been reserved for special groups—for ecclesiastical, social, or intellectual elites. America decided to apply the same democratic tendencies inherent in our society since colonial days to the sphere of education. First, elementary education was extended and made virtually universal. Then secondary education was expanded and made available to all. And in this century, the same democratic notions have been applied to higher education. Because the resources were not available to churches and private institutions to carry out this far-reaching concept—and, indeed, much education had been designed to preserve aristocratic and ecclesiastical privilege—the state undertook the gigantic task of financing the Great Experiment.

As a result, our entire system of education has undergone sweeping changes. Rather than being controlled by local communities, schools have come under the increasing control of public agencies on the regional, state, and national levels. In elementary and secondary education, only the Roman Catholic Church has made extensive efforts to keep control of the educational process within a limited community, and this effort has met with declining success. On the level of higher education, the attempts of Protestants and Catholics to retain ecclesiastical control have weakened as the crisis of resources has relentlessly emerged.

Amazing consequences of the Great Experiment are already in evidence. More obvious changes are the tremendous growth in the educational establishment, the great increase in amounts expended on education, the tremendous growth in numbers of students at all levels, and the multiplication of functions performed by the educational systems. There are also less obvious changes. A vast reservoir of trained personnel has been available to undergird the expansion of American society. Never before has a social group taken possession of a wilderness, developed its industry, acquired a culture, and achieved global hegemony so rapidly as has the United States.

Technical mastery, advanced research, and mass-produced innovation have become the hallmarks of contemporary America.

Through our diversified educational system, we have tapped the abilities of middle and lower socio-economic groups largely excluded from opportunity and leadership in older systems. Paths have been opened to the "late bloomers" and to the socially disadvantaged. Where we are yet failing to absorb all potential resources, strong pressures to democratize further push us forward irresistibly. The G. I. Bill after World War II provided a giant step toward universal higher education, and programs to widen opportunities for the socially disadvantaged continue to multiply. So rapidly have we developed and such close continuity with Western culture have we maintained, that we usually forget that in the eyes of Europe we are an upstart civilization scarcely out of colonial and frontier conditions.

The massive shift from elite to democratic concepts of education and the launching of the Great Experiment in America have yielded enormous advantages for American society. But certain dangers have also accompanied the transition. We may put the change in another way: We have moved from a situation in which society—through various communities, local and intentional—was the sponsor of education to a situation in which the state is now dominant. The various components of American society, with all their diversity, once presided over the communication of our cultural tradition through control of the educational media. Now, increasingly, the state provides the context in which culture is communicated. This way of putting the matter suggests its more ominous possibilities. Sponsorship by the state may lead from dominance to control of education, and from control to totalitarian indoctrination.

This peril has been present for some time but has become more evident in recent years. It has caused concern on the part of social liberals. But one cause of the upsurge of the radical right today is opposition to the taking over by the state of the functions of communicating culture, functions previously controlled by various communities whether locally or ideologically, whether socially or religiously defined. When we consider ways in which public control of education has overcome parochial forms of discrimination and provided increased financing and quality, there is good reason to welcome the shift that has taken place. But

when one becomes aware of the possibilities of state control of educational processes, of indoctrinating the young in a nationalistic cultus which identifies patriotism with the endorsement of prevailing national policies, then one begins to recognize the perils implicit in the situation for traditional American freedoms–the right to dissent and the protection of minority points of view. Ecclesiastical authority was once the major threat to freedom of opinion and education. Today the state–whether through a narrow conception of police power or through the investigative authority of the F.B.I., whether through the force of available funds or the covert influences of the C.I.A.–has become the most significant threat to freedom and diversity in America.

The threat from the state to higher education is more from the distortion of purposes through funds eagerly sought by educators rather than from direct pressure. Nevertheless, it would be an incalculable loss if the churches ceased to exercise a countervailing power over against state-supported higher education. The issue is not merely that competition is good for educational business but that real limitation of the power and influence of state education is essential for our society. However, this counteraction must not be passive. Church-related higher education must search for ways to contribute creatively to the common good of our society and of mankind.

We need church-related colleges today to provide alternatives to the deadly tendencies toward educational sameness in a system of higher education which gives the appearance of great diversity. At the conclusion of a report on a spectrum of institutions, Warren Bryan Martin writes:

> In the first chapter it was stated that whereas the diversity of form and function in higher education has been heretofore regarded as the chief distinguishing characteristic of the American system of education. . . . now, in the conclusions, it is necessary to acknowledge that there was no widespread evidence, in any of the prime interest groups at colleges in the Institutional Character study, of commitment to value diversity to the point that such differences would not only be tolerated but encouraged, could not only survive but actually prosper.

When tendencies toward bland imitation of other institutions, not only in curriculum but more basically in purposes and commitments, threaten excellence in education, then diversity in

control must be cultivated. Church-related colleges play a significant role within contemporary higher education by insuring the continuation of diversity. It is not necessary to have idealistic dreams about them or make spurious claims to uniqueness in order to affirm that cutting their church ties would eliminate a force making for diversity of values and commitments. As our society seems ever more intent upon inculcating narrow, chauvinistic values, such diversity must be prized even more highly.

The greatest enemy of education, as of democracy, is easy agreement and coerced consent. Diversity of viewpoint is essential in learning, and a clash of opinions is the core of education in critical thinking. Enforced orthodoxies may be memorized, but they do not educe innovative reflection. Consensual training, whether in a classroom on a campus or within an educational system, encourages rote learning, but only dissentious processes and conflicting perspectives lift learning above dull routine toward genuine education.

Despite the lessons of history and the insights of educational psychology, one still finds mediocre administrators and timid professors, threatened by controversy and fearful of dissent, striving to maintain false and therefore dangerous harmonies. Not only are unpopular opinions excluded because their presence might disturb wealthy constituencies, but differing perspectives are often excluded because insecure academicians feel inadequate in the presence of complexity.

Defense of diversity and dissent in the name of educational excellence must be made before every constituency from which a college hopes to receive support. Such defense need not be based on the liberal optimism that a free marketplace of viewpoints will inevitably produce truth. Instead, it might better be rooted in the Christian conviction that all power—whether in the realm of the physical or the realm of ideas—must be limited by counterpower, that partial views need the countervailing thrust of other views. Church-related colleges may enrich their own educational climate as well as serve a useful role in the wider context of American higher education by the cultivation of dissentious processes of learning and critical pluralism in societal values.

Though church-related and private institutions may perform this countervailing function by their very existence, they may find it possible to play an even more active and vital role. With their relative independence of pressures from political bodies, these colleges may find new educational patterns in which to serve as pioneers for the larger community of higher education. Moving creatively beyond the isomorphic tendencies present in both public and non-public higher education, Florida Presbyterian College blazed trails in interdisciplinary curriculum construction and in classroom design. In similar fashion, Lewis and Clark College developed innovatively a program in international education, preparing students better for living in our multi-cultured world.

James Perkins has observed that the rigidity into which German and English patterns of higher education have fallen during this century has inhibited continuing creativity within those European systems. They "are now frozen in the organizational concrete of the German institute and the English college. Now that German, and particularly English, social and economic development both demand and need new and more rounded orientation in higher education, the universities face a major upheaval if they are to respond." Quite clearly, parallel dangers exist at present in American higher education. If we are to escape ossification, then it is necessary for colleges and universities to move quite self-consciously beyond isomorphism and conformity.

By being different, church-related colleges are performing a needed function. These differences will be even more significant if these colleges continue to draw on the resources of the Judeo-Christian faith in order to discover needs in society and to move creatively in response. Technological innovations will probably occur in the well-financed laboratories of the federal-grant universities, but sensitivity to social injustice and striving to make the world more fit for human habitation are areas in which church colleges can join with concerned persons in public and private institutions.

Academic excellence is not enough today. If all colleges attempt to become instant Harvards or creeping Carletons, then the competition for the "best" students and the donors for such education will be won only by the swift and the suave. There are other needs which church-related colleges are meeting and areas into which they might move. In so doing, they will meet important needs other than sheer excellence.

More attention must be given in American education to the large number of students who fall in the middle range of abilities. By circumstance, more than by choice, church-related colleges have in fact been serving this group. The importance of these persons for the quality of society has been vastly underestimated. To educate them for social sensitivity and involvement has potentialities only beginning to be realized. In a democratic society, social change depends not only on innovative leadership but on an electorate prepared to support it. Colleges which have programs in urban studies, in black education, in ecology, and in social change, and which engage students with actual situations and train them in the realities of politics are contributing to a better world.

There is also the group in American society who are now in their late thirties or early forties and who therefore missed out on the expansion of higher education in the 1950's. Persons in this category are often trapped in deadend occupations and suffer great frustration as a result. They are the bitter supporters of right-wing political figures. They support repressive police power and the prevention of dissent. Church-related colleges, because of their close community involvements, can and often are undertaking programs for this disadvantaged group.

Recruiting from minority groups expands the ability of higher education to respond to demands for greater equality. Some colleges are finding opportunities for community education and student learning in the societal division over Viet Nam, in urban renewal, and in international education.

Church-related colleges can transform the tradition of social concern into involvement with the social policy of their regions. These colleges are already providing an essential function through educating future leaders in society. Involvement of the present

leadership in consideration of issues relating to the welfare of the community is a step which colleges are often making and could easily make. One college, faced with the possibility of moving to another city because of an economic depression where it was located, decided instead to aid the local industry and civic leaders in working for economic recovery. The effort was successful and the college grew with the community, receiving greater support and acceptance.

Not all church-related colleges are exercising their power in the area of social change and social policy. But it would be a distinct loss if the churches did not support these colleges to use their strategic locations in communities across the nation to educate students and societal leaders for responsible roles in humanizing the environment.

For the most part, education related to churches in this country has been sectarian and divisive in its effect. The church college has not, until recently, been an exception. But the pressures of the public present in higher education and the pull of the ecumenical future in interchurch relations have had sweeping influence upon most sectors of life and program in institutions sponsored by churches. Write Patillo and Mackenzie:

> People who think that rigid sectarianism is the principal defect of church-related higher education are 50 years behind the times.

We are in a new situation in world culture, one which offers the possibilities for contributions to education from church colleges emerging from their sectarian past and denominational relationships. As we move into an era when education for ecumenicity is needed, we must not lose the relationship to particular ecclesiastical communities which is enriching educational preparation for living in a world of diversity.

The ecumenical movement among various Christian groups today points to a wider phenomenon which is a controlling characteristic of the contemporary world. Human society has been divided into widely divergent communities of interpretation as far back as we can trace man's history. Man has worshipped different gods, understood his world in diverse ways, regarded his fellow humans in various perspectives, and ordered his priorities around different purposes. Heretofore, men could live in

their communities relatively untouched by conflicting faiths except in times of upheaval or in cosmopolitan centers. Now the technological revolution in communications and travel brings all communities of interpretation into close confrontation within the global marketplace. Education for dividedness is no longer education for living in *this* world. We must be prepared not only for ecumenicity but for living in the global marketplace of conflicting faiths and life-styles.

Church-related education, to the extent that it can escape the confines of a sectarian past, is in an excellent position to educate for a world of creative diversity. This can be done by recognizing and lifting to a level of careful examination the religious and national variety of our world, by providing direct experience with different cultural and ethnic orientations, and by cultivating an educational process inclusive of multiple faith perspectives.

Cultural and international studies can contribute to such education, as can programs which take students off campus into study abroad and into cities, ghettos, and policy-shaping centers. But further, church colleges can enter into alliances with other denominational colleges for these programs. Both students and instructors will stand explicitly within particular faith contexts as they work and learn together. In this way, the sectarian past may contribute to rather than hamper education for ecumenicity and for participation in the global marketplace. What appears as a disadvantage may instead be utilized to enhance education. For we do not exist in a world of non-faith, as the public arena would often lead us to pretend, but rather in a world of multiple, contending faiths within which we must learn to live.

Education of this kind will teach that we need not fear those of different faiths but can, instead, learn from them in ways which will enrich our own faith and our life together. We educate in such a context not for a dividedness which no longer really exists but for creative diversity in a global culture.

As sectarian fears have declined and the diversity of the public present has become clear, many church-related colleges have already moved into varieties of consortia with other denominational institutions–to share teaching resources, to engage in

joint programs abroad or in urban settings, for student exchange programs; for shared facilities in libraries, science laboratories, and computer equipment. Models for cooperation are proliferating. It would be a serious loss to the American educational system if the contribution presently being made, and that which is potential, within the close cooperation of college and church were abandoned.

Probably the greatest loss, if the ties between college and church were severed, would be sustained by the churches; but this loss to the churches would also be detrimental to American society. To put it another way, one of the most important contributions which church-related colleges make to society is indirectly through the churches by which they are sponsored. Quite clearly, this indirect contribution of higher education to society through the churches is and can be made also by public colleges and universities; but the closer the relation, provided it is not one of control on one side or the other, the greater the possibilities of usefulness.

One clarification is in order at this point, one which applies to all that has been said about the contribution of church-related colleges to society. Many hold, either by intention or through inadvertence, that the purpose of religion is to serve and enhance the society of which it is a part. In particular, a criterion often applied to Christianity in the United States is its usefulness to American society. Some would even deny to the churches the right to be critical of national policies and goals. Let me dissociate myself from these and similar views. While it is true that religion does serve to bind personal, social, and cultural action systems into a whole, it also provides both the legitimation of and critical perspective upon the value structure and goals of these systems. The Judeo-Christian heritage and the institutions in American society which purport to embody that heritage have contributed much to that society and will continue to do so, but they do not exist *in order to* serve that society. The purposes which they serve are rooted in a wider reality than is encompassed in any one society, and the faith which empowers that heritage is constantly transcending the values of every particular special group. Those who would judge churches by their contribution

to the national values and purposes betray that heritage and announce their real religion to be nationalism. We may push the point even further and assert that the most important contribution which churches make to American society is through their critique of cultural norms. Such a critique impels a society toward the continuing change and permanent revolution essential to its development.

Though churches have often served to endorse the *status quo*, minorities inspired by Judeo-Christian faith have provided continuing and crucial sources of protest, criticism, and change in the United States. The decade now closing is no exception.

In this era of increasing complexity and rapidly developing technology, churches and churchmen need more than devotion and commitment in order to take action on behalf of change which will make the world more human. The church-related college is increasingly becoming a resource for churches as they seek to engage society on its creative edge of change. Father John Walsh has stated it this way: "To think of the Catholic university as an instrument of the Church for the carrying out of its *teaching* mission leads, I think, both to serious misunderstanding of the Church's teaching mission in itself and to profound distortions of the nature of a university. . . . It appears to me that the generic relationship between the Church and the Catholic university is one of the manifestations–perhaps the highest formal, explicit, and systematic manifestation–of the Church *learning*."

To the extent that the churches take seriously their mission to be agents of criticism and change in American society, they must enter into the realm of policy research and social policy development. In the modern world, policy inquiry and action cannot be carried out either exclusively or even primarily by clergy. Nor is it sufficient to talk of the ministry of the laity. Rather, policy inquiry and action require the ministry of churchmen in sectors of society where they are not laymen but experts and responsible for policy decisions.

Churches must have close ties with higher education if the resources of new knowledge and skills are to shape the ministries which the contemporary world requires. No longer is it possible

to rely on catechetical classes and Sunday schools–and it was probably never either wise or possible–for the preparation of ministers, lay and clerical, for the diverse needs of society. Colleges and universities–church-sponsored, private, and public–are required for the enormous and varied challenges of ministry in our complex and changing world. Two functions, at least, are essential: first, to educate youth who have some grasp of contemporary society and culture and who therefore have the potential for leadership in ministry; and second, to provide the technical knowledge and expert skills required for ministry. This is no time for cutting ties between churches and colleges!

Social policy requires the uniting of commitment, knowledge, and the power of decision. Let us not underestimate the contribution which churches as communities of faith and action can make to the humanization of society, but let us not deceive ourselves into believing that ministry can be carried out apart from the training and skills which higher education offers.

Such a view has implications for the relation of church agencies to church-sponsored colleges. The older attempts at sectarian control, which in most cases are no longer possible, must be abandoned. Colleges will be useful to churches only as they participate in the marketplace of academic freedom and performance. Nor should funds from church agencies be allocated without carefully-ordered priorities to any college bearing the denominational name. Instead, church agencies ought to use their financial resources: 1) to provide basic academic strength, 2) to encourage joint planning and action with other colleges in order to strengthen the educational process, 3) to provide for development of programs which prepare youth to become sensitive and experienced agents of change whether their ministries will be in ecclesiastical or public positions, and 4) to encourage the development of social policy education which will provide resources for churches and public groups in understanding the needs of man today and taking action to improve the human lot.

The task of the churches in higher education has not been completed. Many contributions are yet to be made. If colleges and churches sever their ties, what will be lost is not the past or the present but the future.

## Commentary

**Sr. Mary Griffin, B.V.M.**

My major problem in responding to Dr. McCoy's incisive paper was how to say anything more than a Molly Bloom-ish "yes" whenever he stopped for breath. For I found myself in practically continuous agreement with what he was saying, namely that church-related higher education is in crisis:

a) that it's not sure who it is;

b) that it's not sure what purpose it serves;

c) that it's not at all sure that it has a future.

Actually, Dr. McCoy is quite reassuring on these three scores. He traces the long and not undistinguished past of the church colleges and lists the important contributions such schools are making today—not least among these the fact that they are providing visible alternatives of form and function in a system of education increasingly government dominated.

But when he looks to the future, he predicts that only those schools will survive, and perhaps deserve to survive, which have the courage to play a radically new role in American society—one no longer isolated, no longer unique, no longer protectionist. For if it is to live up to its claims of Christian faith, the church college will have to move out of its splendid isolationism into a position of open servanthood, acknowledging its solidarity with man and society and addressing itself through specifications and programs to the common good. In short, he is proposing not a theological but an ethical goal, not a metaphysical but a prophetic role, not a stance of fervent endorsement of prevailing national policies, but of critical dissent from policies repressive of minority points of view.

William Shirer, speaking in Chicago recently, hazarded the prediction that America could be the first democratic nation in history freely to vote in facism. In that city where the forces of law and the use of violence are beginning to appear synonymous, such a threat had an ominous ring. Dr. McCoy's paper does not exaggerate in suggesting that today it is the state which is becoming the "most significant threat to freedom and diversity in

America," and that it would be an incalculable loss if the churches ceased to mount a countervailing power against state-supported higher education.

Yet church colleges must do more than attempt to neutralize the increasingly repressive temper of the country. George Pickering, director of a Chicago-based research institute, points out that the social program of the churches is at a moment of critical decision which cannot be evaded. It centers around the general question of institutional seriousness and "whether that can become integral to the social program of the churches."

The problem of the colleges allied with these churches, is, I feel, identical. As Mr. Pickering puts it, "institutional seriousness is of a piece with unflinching encounter with the issues of the social order; . . . it need not be a retreat from such matters. . . . encounter is indeed of the *essence* of the institution which is being called to seriousness."

Two questions emerge from such a line of reasoning: 1) How acceptable would such a self-understanding be among church colleges? 2) How—practically speaking—could these schools creatively respond on the level of program and action to the challenge which Dr. McCoy would set for them? He himself has cited some imaginative answers to the latter question, stressing the importance of cultivating "dissensual processes of learning and critical pluralism in societal values." In calling attention to the over-30's group trapped in deadening jobs and drifting bitterly to the political right, he gives a new dimension to the word "disadvantaged" and suggests an important new segment of concern for church-related colleges. To Florida Presbyterian and Lewis and Clark colleges, suggested as trail-blazing models, I would add Johnston College, the new cluster college of the University of Redlands, which is evolving an educational pattern around intercultural, interpersonal and international values and attempting to respond creatively to urban and social needs in its own region as well as in distant cultures. From colleges like these should come if not community leaders, certainly an enlightened electorate ready to support the programs of social change which can bring about a better world non-violently, in a Christian way.

To my first question: How acceptable would be this self-understanding among church colleges—this image as servant, as

prophet, as critic of the culture in which it exists, there is no ready answer. Speaking from the vantage point of the schools I know most intimately–the Catholic colleges–I would be inclined to say that this self-concept might prove to be a controversial one. For it would seem that

a) there are no models to go by

b) there is no theology to support it

c) there is no tradition to encourage it.

Yet this self-understanding is certainly in the spirit of the social statements of Vatican II, especially *The Constitution on the Church in the Modern World,* by far the most encouraging document yet produced by the Church with reference to the building up of the social order. That Constitution does in many places give strong directives toward the development of a society that is human and of institutions that serve individuals. It speaks of restructuring the economic order, of political involvement, and of the conscious development of culture. But even in this document which insists on an essentially secular role for the Christian there are constant reminders that this world is not all.

The notion of servanthood appears to me to have been a minor theme in post-Tridentine Catholicism which has always emphasized the world as a threat to individual salvation and reminded its members that they are citizens of two worlds. Up to Vatican II we Catholics came predominately out of a tradition of splendid isolationism and unique mission. And perhaps no group has been more deeply involved with this two-world notion than the religious orders which in America have founded and still control and maintain a major share of the Catholic colleges. Even when the great social encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI have been taught on Catholic campuses, it has been hard to see in the lives of our graduates that the injunctions to reconstruct the social order have been taken seriously. As Andrew Greeley discovered in his recent study of Catholic alumni of 1961, only 36% accepted the Kerner Report's claim that white racism does cause Negro unrest.

Moreover the Catholic college has always had a double goal in educating its students: 1) to protect their faith from the world; 2) to help the immigrants up the social ladder in that same world.

Thus our colleges have admittedly played a socialization role which now makes it difficult to foster criticism of society. Protestant colleges, after all, like Protestant churches, grew up in a tradition of dissent. Catholic colleges are out of a tradition which has rejected it. And even now Catholic dissent lags behind Protestant dissent on university campuses. To develop, as Dr. McCoy suggests, programs of study and action aimed at serving the public good is to ask for an unprecedented value commitment and public stance on the part of the church colleges.

As the experience of the Vietnam Moratorium disclosed, it will be hard for any church-related college to do this without risking the accusation of institutional involvement in politics and experiencing a possible loss of funds. The president of one north-shore campus which had taken an institutional stand against the war, reminded his faculty that "As a not-for-profit corporation operating under the laws of the state of Illinois and with tax-exemption privileges from the Federal Government," the college "may not lend its corporate support to efforts that may influence legislation."

Yet the needs of the times do point to such a revolutionary mission for the Christian college, whatever it costs to do so. And some schools will, I am certain, move in this direction of social concern and action.

For the Catholic college which sees it this way there are positive forces of support. The new spirit of ecumenism is breaking down the isolation of Catholicism. New Biblical scholarship and theological interpreters like Rahner and de Chardin have reawakened Catholics to their solidarity with the human family and their responsibility for creative involvement in this world here and now.

Admittedly not all Catholic colleges, not all church colleges, are "exercising their power in the area of social change and social policy." Dr. McCoy has articulated ways in which the colleges can humanize the environment, can serve human and not merely sectarian needs, or in Mr. Riesman's words, can "fuse academic proficiency with concern for questions of ultimate social and moral importance." (*The Academic Revolution*, p. 405) Dr. McCoy suggests that we need church-related colleges

today to provide alternatives to the deadly tendencies toward educational sameness. The implication here, of course, is that the church-tie does make for diversity in values and commitment. If this is true, one would expect church colleges to be characterized by such things as

a) a visible commitment to the common good

b) a high level of social consciousness

c) a fearless criticism of national morality

d) a notable climate of academic freedom

e) a pervasive practice of social justice, etc.

Unfortunately, at the present moment one cannot make such claims for many church colleges. Like their secular counterparts, church colleges have managed to ignore the same needs in society—the needs of blacks, for example, of Indians, of minorities generally. Now with tuition costs spiralling they are in danger of ignoring the poor.

Like many another observer of the educational scene, I do not think that church-related colleges will disappear overnight. But unless they are dramatically revivified in the terms we have been discussing here today, their influence will inevitably decline and the important contributions they might have made will be lost both to the churches and to American society. It is to be hoped that Dr. McCoy's provocative assessment of what these colleges could be about in the 1970's does not come too late to make a significant difference.

# Secularization — Public Trust: The Development of Catholic Higher Education in the United States

Joseph P. Kelly

It is a difficult task to present a paper concerned with society and particularly with two of societies most significant and turbulent institutions . . . colleges and churches. As society becomes more complex every institution is being called upon to give an account of its stewardship. We are all aware of the stresses and strains of our time. These are largely the result of technology, affluence and the rising expectation of involvement in institutions most closely touching our lives. Ours is an age of politics, and the traditional frames in which politics takes place no longer obtain. An uneven, unplanned discussion about the quality and composition of our lives has been under way in the formulation of public policy since the early 1960's. This paper is primarily concerned with the period 1945–1969 . . . the first quarter century of this era of politicization. No longer can the conservative polarize politics by decrying the invasion of the federal government into his life . . . no longer can the liberal hold that all that is needed is more government funding.

We have found that government–federal, state, and local–touch our lives every day. Education, like politics, became almost suddenly, it seems, an all pervasive factor in our lives. Our economy and the promise of a good life for all has made us the first nation in history to hold out the promise of a college education for all of our youth.

It is in this context that the reevaluation of Catholic higher education has been taking place. This paper will pertain specifically to changes in Catholic colleges and universities. The disorientation that these events has caused within the Catholic church has been much more intensive as well as extensive than has occurred in other denominations. However, the pattern of growth and change toward secularization occurring here is essentially the same as that which occurred in Protestant institutions in an earlier era.

I believe there is in the United States a natural evolution from the sponsoring denominational institution to its progeny–the private institution. The recent policy changes authored by St. Louis University, Notre Dame University, and most Catholic colleges and universities support this contention. It is in this way that the churches . . . Catholic and Protestant . . . have made their greatest and most significant contribution to the nation, or . . . to the people of God. Professor Charles E. Peterson traces this development in his paper, *The Church-Related College: Whence Before Whither.* The record, as he describes it, however, is largely the history of other than Catholic institutions.

The contribution that churches have made to the American nation cannot be overestimated and need not be explained . . . the record is clear, from Harvard and Yale to St. Louis University and Notre Dame University. It is difficult to imagine higher education in the United States without this hallowed tradition. It is, however, less difficult to imagine the United States of 2001 with a system of higher education that will include only state institutions. The agenda of all private education should include this possibility as a high priority as we plan for the future.

*The Beginning–A Total System*

Catholic education, from elementary to the university, was the product of an immigrant people who came to live in a nation where institutions and values were predominantly Protestant. There was a unity of purpose and function that underlay this self-contained structure. Its relationship to the general public was consistent. It paid its own way . . . it was avowedly Catholic . . . its purpose was to train Catholics. There is, and can be no question of the contribution this educational system has made to the United States. The system, however, rested upon the premise that there would be, at all times, a sufficient number of religious (priests, brothers and sisters) to staff the schools and colleges. Growth of the institutions and the integration of the Catholic population into the United States were to be key factors in all aspects of change within the Catholic church.

The limits of this paper preclude discussion of the parochial schools in the United States. However, I want to mention the

problem of staffing with religious. It is the same problem that has contributed to a tremendous increase in operating costs at the college and university level. The shortage of sisters to staff parochial schools has placed great financial burdens on the system. It is inevitable that the parochial school system will be radically changed, curtailed or perhaps even phased out. The remaining vestige of it will most likely be prep-type high schools that are expensive and bear little, if any, resemblance to the basically democratic parish or diocesan parochial school. There is a close parallel here to what is happening in Catholic colleges and universities.

*Catholic Colleges, Public Funds, Growth and Secularization*

World War II was a great watershed for Catholic higher education. Following that war, the right to a college education for the more than 12 million veterans who served in that war, was embodied in the G. I. Bill of Rights. It was written to enable the individual to use his stipend at whatever college or university he wished. Under provisions of the law, veterans were able to use the stipend for seminary education as well. The impact this had on all private and church-related, as well as state institutions, is difficult to exaggerate. In the future, it may well be seen that this has had a greater social, economic and political effect on society than the Morrell Act of 1863. However, the concept of tax money going to private and church-related institutions was established. It is interesting to note that there was little or no discussion concerning its constitutionality.

Other breakthroughs in federal funding took place in the 1950's. Laws such as the Public Facilities Act of 1957 are the type to which I refer. These laws were also enacted with no significant analysis of educational priorities. The constitutionality of federal funds to church-related institutions was not questioned to any important degree. The expenditure of tax money for higher education will not be enacted so quickly or so broadly in the future. The survival of public-private institutions may depend upon our ability to meet the demands of the "new politics" of educational financing.

We are a people hard put to place priorities for national policy in any context other than national defense.* After the Soviet Union put Sputnik into space, the American people became more fearful of our security. The reaction of national leaders was that our system of education had fallen far behind Russia in science and technology. A hurried superficial analysis of our educational system was conducted. One result was another infusion of federal money into higher education. The intent of the law was to buttress our national defense. Once again tax money was made available to private as well as state institutions. This was, of course, during the Eisenhower Administration.

The infusion of federal money into Catholic higher education was instrumental in providing growth capital for these institutions. The G. I. Bill of Rights had a great effect on coeducational and men's institutions. The Facilities Act and other laws brought the Catholic colleges owned and operated by religious sisters' congregations into the pattern of growth and development of secularization. During this same period, private foundations began to grant "seed money" to all varieties of colleges and universities.

These events precipitated a serious shortage of priests, brothers and sisters to assume the increased responsibilities. Along with the shortage of religious to staff the colleges and universities, came an ever accelerating increase in operating costs. The government matching grants for facilities proved to be a mixed blessing. It provided basic growth money, but in order to match the grant it required a corresponding increase in the whole area of development, i.e., fund-raising. It was during this period that Catholic institutions took a great leap forward, with little or no analysis of costs, consequences or priorities for their institutions or religious orders.

Catholic educators thought matching grants (government and foundations), and increased student bodies would inevitably produce economically viable colleges and universities. Before any one takes umbrage at this last statement . . . the haphazard

*The rationale for the expenditure of federal money to assist students and to build highways (in the same period) was that our national defense would be strengthened. The result was that these interesting titles are seen in print every day: The National Defense Educational Act and the National Defense Highway Act.

funding of all higher education has entrapped all educators and institutions. Even state universities are caught in the competition for the tax dollar. They have some obvious advantages, however, so we need not sympathize with them.

During this time the pressing problems of Catholic higher education appeared to be matters concerning growth and progress. The questioning of the nature of Catholic institutions had not yet surfaced. When it became an issue, however, its core had little to do with separation of church and state. The inability of Catholic colleges and universities to define their institutional governance and policy with some precision clouds the status of private higher education in the formation of public policy. This could be an important factor in the future of college and university education in the United States.

When the effect of the cost squeeze and the decrease in religious vocations began to intensify, Catholics increasingly went to state legislators for assistance for parochial systems. These questions have at their core interpretations of the First Amendment and the "new politics" of educational funding. It appeared then that Catholic colleges and universities were not to be caught in this same squeeze of cost or constitutionality. It was only after Vatican II that deeper questions of the nature and function of Catholic universities overshadowed, for a time, the issue of aid to beleagured parochial school parents.

As Catholic colleges and universities went to the public for support, as they went public for recruitment of faculty, students, board members, and eventually administrators, they became public or secular institutions. This "going public" is often viewed as being solely for economic reasons. This is too narrow a view of the complex development of church-related institutions. It really underestimates, in my opinion, the genuine desire on the part of Religious to serve mankind in the world rather than "save or convert."

A significant development in this period was the need to make distinctions between Catholic higher education and the elementary and secondary components of that system. It came to be made upon the grounds that indoctrination takes place in the latter, but not in higher education. The need to justify

receipt of tax money for private or church-related colleges and universities precipitated this public dialogue. The record will show that the leadership in elaboration of this viewpoint came from Catholic university presidents. They spoke to the issue at the national level. It is important to note that this occurred before colleges operated by sisters' congregations emerged into the public forum. The case can be made that priest-educators spoke for all Catholic education before 1963. Roman Catholic sisters in higher education did not emerge as "public figures" akin to their priest counterparts until after Vatican II.

Matters concerned with the growth and development of Catholic colleges and universities was further complicated by the tendency of many Catholic educators to view all three levels of Catholic education as "a system." Many religious orders were in the business of "owning and operating" higher educational institutions, as well as elementary and secondary schools. Is it any wonder that people . . . educators and non-educators . . . as well as legislators and judges, in general, tend to view Catholic education as a totality. This confusion is a continuing problem, as I shall discuss later.

By isolating the effects of federal financing on Catholic higher education, one does violence to the complexity of institutional development. During these twenty years or so, there was an increasing diaspora of Catholics from the core cities of metropolitan America into the suburbs. In short, the American Catholic became educated and moved with a degree of affluence into the mainstream of the nation's economic and social life. The nation in which their forebearers felt alien had come to be their country as much as that of 'the Protestants.'

The most conspicuous and distinguished products of this educational system were the priests, sisters and brothers who were making higher education their profession. Too little note has been taken of the causes and consequences of the growth in professionalism that was occurring among professors and administrators of the Catholic colleges in the last two decades of this century. As the religious, faculty and administrators became more and more professional, i.e., secular, their relative and

absolute numbers were decreasing, and their institutions were growing larger and more complex.

*The Sixties: Politics–Vatican II and Accountability*

These changes in the Catholic church took place when technology was able to focus the nation and the world's attention on matters that had never been reported in the media, much less discussed openly within religious orders. Most American Catholics took pride in one of their number being elected to the presidency at this time. The response of Pope John XXIII to the people of the world who were not of his faith elicited the same kind of feelings. These events and times gave promise to be the precursor of an "era of good feeling" in the Christian world.

This radical questioning of Catholic institutions has been all pervasive for at least six years. The questioning of basic values and institutions of the Catholic church had its public roots . . . its sanction . . . in Vatican II. It was in this frame that discussion of the nature of Catholic colleges and universities began to occur. The fact that questions pertaining to authority and obedience, collegiality of bishops, birth control, the nature and validity of religious life itself, and priestly celibacy, all took place at the same time, intensified the difficulties of those whose profession of religious vows had taken them into responsible positions in Catholic colleges and universities. It is to the great credit of Catholic educators and the Church, in general, that the bulk of this discussion took place in academic circles.

The Catholic church's battle of aggiornamento was conducted in an all inclusive frame, ranging from the proper length of nun's habits to the deepest Constitutional questions of the First Amendment's provision of separation of church and state, to the nature of papal authority. It was almost impossible to know whether a priest or sister spoke for the Church as a religious, or as a university president. Rules . . . functions . . . rights . . . obligations . . . all were mixed in with almost every religious who spoke publicly. The individual listening decided in which role the priest or sister was speaking.

The call for ecumenism that flowed from Vatican II had perhaps its greatest impact on Catholic colleges and universities

in three important ways: (1) The wall of separateness was greatly reduced between Catholic institutions and those in the state and private sector; (2) The principle of public debate and discussion came on the scene with a vengeance; and (3) Nearly all Catholic colleges and universities rushed with great vigor to include laymen, Catholic and others, in their support structure . . . all done, of course, in the relatively old "advisory board" frame. By this time, Catholic institutions had taken giant steps toward being more public than Catholic.

The debate was cast in terms of what is a Catholic college . . . why should they survive . . . are they unique . . . or just the same as Harvard? The irony of this question was lost on many during this heated period of discussion.

Professor Peterson says in his survey of the American experience of church-related colleges, that as Protestant denominational colleges went "secular" it was generally within the framework of localism, and occasioned no great uproar among the denominations that had originally sponsored the institutions. This is definitely not the case in the Catholic pattern of growth, development and definition. There was to be no blessed anonymity for the Catholic institutions and religious orders as they made the public transition to secularity.

The conditions in which this trend has been taking place among Catholic church-related colleges exhibited several major differences when compared to other denominations. First, the Protestant churches were in no way as binding in authority and obedience as was the Catholic church. Second, was the fact the Catholic school system was so interwoven into the fabric of the lives of Catholics–elementary, high school, colleges and universities–that any change in one area triggered a response in other parts of the Catholic constituency. Third, only a few institutions like St. Louis University were deeply rooted in the local community, as Professor Peterson tells us earlier denominational colleges were. Certainly, few if any sister colleges were thought of as community assets by their immediate neighbors.

A brief survey of the continuing debate among Catholic educators will serve to show the intensity of feelings over the recent policies as espoused by such eminent educators as Father

Paul Reinert and Father Theodore Hesburgh for their institutions and religious orders. My point is not to set up straw men . . . rather it is to try to underscore this murkiness of purpose and the effect it has on questions of public policy for higher education in general, and for private institutions in particular.

An important example of one who decries recent developments in Catholic higher education is Eugene E. Grollmes, S.J., who states,

> Since their founding, Catholic colleges have been concerned about salvation. Lately, however, the focus of their concern seems to have changed somewhat. Instead of the salvation of their students, Catholic colleges have become more and more concerned with their own salvation.[1]

He rebukes Father Paul Reinert for his statement,

> The preservation and development of Catholic higher education is based on the assumption that we have something unique to offer for the benefit of American society.[2]

The difference between Father Reinert and Father Grollmes is basic and speaks directly to the question of the nature and governance of Catholic institutions. This difference is at the heart of the question of developing Catholic institutions, and their obvious movement into the public-private sector that characterizes all but a few Catholic colleges and universities. If Catholic colleges and universities exist that ascribe to Father Grollmes view of salvation as part of the policy, governance, counselling, and curriculum, then they can rightly be classified as church-related or Catholic. However, they would then be very different institutions than St. Louis University, Notre Dame University and Fordham University, just to mention a few.

Professor Robert B. Nordberg, Marquette University, writes in 1967,

> One simply doesn't know from day to day, any more, what it means to be a Catholic. By the same token, one doesn't know what it means to be a Catholic institution.[3]

---

[1]Eugene E. Grollmes, S.J., *Catholic Colleges: The Pearl Called Uniqueness,* (Catholic Educational Review, 1967), p. 361.

[2]*Ibid.*

[3]Robert B. Nordberg, S.J., *The Role of Catholic Universities: How Confused Can We Get?* (Catholic Educational Review, 1967), p. 433.

Father Grollmes takes a harder tack in the following remark concerning honesty among his fellow Catholics:

> If Catholic educators honestly believe these teachings are true, then it would seem they incur the obligation to act like it, and their institutions should, naturally, but unmistakably reflect this belief.[4]

This challenge should be directed to the religious superiors of the administrators and, apparently, faculty to whom he refers.

Professor Nordberg's view as to who should constitute the faculty of a Catholic university where a, ". . . 'vision of the whole' permeates every part."[5] is most interesting. He writes,"Those, obviously, who have this vision."[6] . . . in the same article he continues, "And never should it (the Catholic university) hire a faculty member who shows no evidence of having had that vision in the first place."[7] It is obvious that this "selectivity" raises serious questions as to the quality, purpose as well as the right to public funds of a college or university that espouses these views as their reason for being. This leads directly into questions of the First Amendment and the Maryland Case.

Dr. Dennis Bonnett, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Niagara University, New York, is also concerned with the condition of Catholic education. His statement illustrates the confusion I spoke of earlier when people lump the three levels of education together. He writes,

> In a general pastoral letter dated nearly a century ago, the hierarchy of the United States made clear those reasons for which a Catholic educational system was necessary—thereby illustrating the evils which must be expected to fill the lacuna created by secularization. Dare we assert that 'popularized irreligion' and 'agnosticism' represent no real threat today?[8]

Professor Bonnett has this to say concerning his fellow educators,

> Those Catholic educators who presently flee from the "stigma" of orthodoxy, and in the name of "academic freedom" would gladly

---

[4]*Op. Cit.*, p. 364.

[5], [6], [7]*Op. Cit.*, p. 439.

[8]Dennis Bonnett, *The Effect of Secularism in Catholic Higher Education on American Society*, (Catholic Educational Review, 1968-69), p. 147.

> exchange the values of Christian humanism in favor of a thoroughly secular humanism exhibit the most glaring instance of Secularism and Modernism. For, in seeking to "free" the educational process from the guidance of the Magisterium of the Church, they would cut off the training of society from the influence of true religion.[9]

One has to wonder why this complaint is not addressed to the governing board of these institutions.

One last example from the same source is worth noting,

> . . . that even dogma is not allowed to stand in the way of those who would betray the teaching of the Church and secularize Her schools.[10]

This statement would seem to call for even a higher authority than the board of trustees when the debate over the direction of the college or university reaches "dogma . . . vision . . . salvation" it enters the realm of theological orthodoxy. Therein lies the crux of the problem of this traditional position. It is, however, this area that has not been thoroughly discussed within Catholic academic and religious communities.

It is not my intention to take lightly the men or the ideas they espouse. Their position, on the contrary, is important because it takes issue with such outstanding Catholic educators and institutions. Their position has an internal consistency. However, it does not reflect church-related higher education development in the United States.

The questions raised by these traditional educators does deserve more serious attention and discussion. This kind of evaluation has significance within and without the Catholic constituency. It can no longer be the concern only of the religious orders and the hierarchy. No one can fault legislators, courts and other educators in their being confused about Catholic colleges and universities. This is apt to be more crucial in the future than in the immediate past. I refer not to constitutional issues, but rather to the highly political question of the status and value private higher education is to have in national and state governmental priorities.

---

[9] *Op. Cit.*, p. 145.

[10] *Op. Cit.*, p. 146.

Father Paul C. Reinert, S.J., is by any standards, one of the United States best academic administrators. Father Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C., is an undisputed leader in American education. They have been taken to task by Justus George Lawler,* for saying, "Legal control by boards with a majority of lay trustees is definitely the pattern for the future;" "Catholic schools have become public trusts that should reflect the interests, needs and desires of a much broader spectrum of people."[11]

Professor Lawler pursues his quarry further in a most vigorous manner,

> If these are just the usual fund grubbing proclamations of Catholic administrators who are obsessed with competing with non-Catholic institutions on the one level when competition is foredoomed–endowment and physical plant–then such statements may be dismissed as negligibly opportunistic. . .[12]
>
> The truth is that administrators think only in administrative categories and therefore, cannot see any other solution to the present crisis in Catholic higher education than to shift the authority to a level where they, the administrators, will still retain the accouterments of office. Whereas what is obviously demanded is that administration be reduced to the performance of its proper housecleaning functions–to maintaining the groun[illegible]eat and the buildings clean–and that the actual control of the institutions be vested in the faculty and its chosen representatives. In too many ways our universities still live in a Counter Reformation world, the military world symbolized by St. Ignatius–which is not intended to disparage the Jesuits who, quite simply, constitute the intellect of the American Church. What we have to return to is the ideal of the medieval university, to a world symbolized by Dominic and Benedict whose priories and abbeys still freely elect their own leaders.[13]

Does anyone really believe men like Father Reinert, Father O'Laughlin, Father Hesburgh and Monsignor John McGrath fit their diatribe? Or, that the operation of a college or university

---

*Justus George Lawler, editor of "Continuum," an independent quarterly, sponsored by St. Xavier College, Chicago, Illinois. Author of *Christian Image*, 1965; *The Range of Commitment, Essays of a Conservative Liberal*, 1968; *Nuclear War: Ethic, Rhetoric, Reality*, 1966.

11, 12Justus George Lawler, *In Defense of the Catholic University*, (Catholic *Mind*, 1967), p. 26.

13*Op. Cit.*, p. 27.

is as simple as Professor Lawler seems to infer? If so, then the real offenders must, of necessity, be the religious superiors of these priests.

The confusion concerning Catholic higher education, however, stems not only from the more traditional educators. Father Hesburgh takes Dr. Harvey Cox to task for stating, ". . . what is the role of the Church in the university?" . . . and answering, "The organizational Church has no role. It should stay out."[14]

Referring in the same paper to Miss Jacqueline Grennan's concern that the Church or the hierarchy might be forced to endorse or negate the actions of a Catholic college or university, Father Hesburgh writes,

> "I simply say there is no such pressure on the Church or the hierarchy under Notre Dame's *present* form of governance, which places it as an institution under civil, not canon law."[15] [The emphasis on "present" is the writer's, not that of Father Hesburgh.]

This policy statement by Father Hesburgh and the institutional actions of St. Louis University, Fordham University, Webster College and universities too numerous to mention, form the basis of my thesis. I received a call last week from a board member of a college operated by a sister's congregation concerning their search for a president. When asked what form of governance (ownership and control in an earlier era) they had, he replied, "We (he is a layman) are severing (terminating) legal and canon relations with the Church." He explained further, that the Board would be self-perpetuating, and would not be limited to Catholics. The Board would not be subject, in any way, to the founding order of sisters. He repeated, that the college would be "secular." When a Catholic religious order implements this policy, the college or university is a public-private institution and not church-related.*

---

[14]Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., *The Vision of a Great Catholic University*, (Catholic *Mind*, 1968), p. 45.

[15]*Ibid.*, p. 47.

---

*The status of diocesan colleges is different from those conducted by religious orders. I would guess in the long run their development will be similar. This is certain unless the diocese can provide sufficient financial support. A major difference between order and diocesan institutions is that the latter has financial support from the

*The Search For Clarity*

Soon after the peak was reached in the ideological furor over these moves to secularity, there appeared a definitive statement of what had been happening in Catholic academic institutions. Monsignor McGrath's short treatise, *Catholic Institutions in the United States: Canonical and Civil Law Status,* 1968, examines the questions involved in this paper.

Monsignor McGrath states,

> . . . the charitable and educational institutions conducted under the auspices of the Church were recognized as civil law institutions and not subject to the canon law of the Church.
>
> Charitable and educational institutions chartered as corporations under American law are not owned by the sponsoring body. The legal title to the real and personal property is vested in the corporation.
>
> It is the *corporation that buys and sells and borrows money.* If anyone owns the assets of the charitable or educational institution, *it is the general public.* Failure to appreciate this fact has led to the mistaken idea that the property of the institution is the property of the sponsoring body.

He continues,

> Since the institution and the sponsoring body are two separate and distinct entities, the question arises as to what makes the institution Catholic? The answer to this question lies in the influence over the institution exercised by the sponsoring body. The structure of American corporations provides four vehicles for directing and effectuating this influence: (1) the charter and by-laws; (2) the board of trustees; (3) the administration; and (4) the staff of the corporation.[16]

I, for one, have serious reservations about some of Monsignor McGrath's conclusions as stated above. This excellent work gives promise of clearing away a great deal of underbrush from the question of Catholic colleges and universities and their church-relatedness. However, there remains a great deal to be said by

---

[16]Monsignor John J. McGrath, *Catholic Institutions in the United States: Canonical and Civil Law Status,* (The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1968), pp. 32–33. [The emphases are the writer's, not those of Monsignor McGrath.]

---

institutional church. Colleges and universities operated by religious orders do not. The simple exception is the Catholic University of America. This institution receives proceeds from a yearly collection taken at Sunday Mass across the nation–November 30, was the day for that collection this year, 1969.

Catholic educators and their religious orders on this subject. There can be no question that what Monsignor McGrath has described is in process in much of Catholic higher education today. His treatise is a road map for many Catholic colleges and universities.

The thesis of this paper is that those colleges and universities opting along lines described in Monsignor McGrath's book are public-private institutions. They are public in their charters . . . goals . . . purposes . . . governance . . . in their recruitment of faculty . . . students . . . administrators . . . and in their requests for support. These requests are based upon their service to society. Institutions that clearly state their governance and institutional policy in this manner leave those who would appeal to the First Amendment or the Maryland Case with no argument. These institutions are not "church-related." I agree with Dr. Cox and with the policy made by such great Catholic educators as Father Reinert, Father Hesburgh, Father McLaughlin, and Mrs. Jacqueline Grennan Wexler. They, like Monsignor McGrath, have led the way with courage and determination. However, their boards of trustees, i.e , their religious superiors and their orders have been the "responsible enablers." The position they have taken that their institutions are "public trusts" and not "owned and controlled" speaks volumes about religious detachment in the secular* affairs.

Let me conclude by saying that these educators, their religious orders, and their institutions are answering the greatest need of American higher education. Their response to the demands of service to the people of their country, as well as to their chosen profession as educators, is in the best tradition of the Church in the United States. Charles F. Donovan, S.J., Academic Vice-President of Boston College, said in 1963, "The history of American higher education is a sad story of loss of faith by religious institutions." [17] I disagree!

---

*A personal note: My closest, most personal spiritual counsellors and friends, as I grew up in the parochial school system, were secular priests. The word secular never held any but positive meaning for me.

[17] *Op. Cit.*, p. 375.

I read this history in a different way . . . Another educator, Ladislas M. Orsy, S.J., chairman of the Theology Department at Fordham University, says it eloquently, ". . . can a university be Catholic? If the question means: can the university receive the gift of faith, hope and love? the answer is no. Only persons can receive the gift of the theological virtues. If the question means: is the community of the university assisted by the Holy Spirit, the answer is negative again. Such assistance is guaranteed to the Church only. For these reasons, theologically and logically it is no more possible to speak about a Catholic university than about a Catholic state."[18]

[18]Ladislas M. Orsy, S.J., *A Catholic Presence,* (America, V. 120, April 5, 1969), p. 397.

## Commentary

**William G. Guindon, S.J.**

Dr. Kelly's thoughtful paper has rounded out the discussion of last evening, by presenting some further aspects of the present situation regarding Catholic colleges. He has added, beyond the comments of Dr. Ford and others, still other particulars of these twentieth-century developments in Church-related Christian education. It would still seem appropriate, however, to clarify and distinguish even further several of the areas upon which Dr. Kelly has touched.

First of all, I think we should attend to the fact that this discussion is being carried out on at least two levels: the theological, or motivational, level, and the institutional, or administrative, level.

The theological level embraces, among other things, the aims of the founders, whether church elders, members of a religious order, or Christian layfolk; on this level, in many, if not all, denominations, we see the gradual shift in emphasis from explicit indoctrination to academic presentation, coupled with heightened awareness of the value of giving witness. We note the strong trend, as faculty and administration have become better educated, to place witness (and pastoral service) ahead of instruction in orthodoxy. (In this connection, Vatican II merely recognized and blessed what was already a strong and healthy trend in Catholic education.) We can decry, also, a strong thread of re-evaluation of the means and modes of witness in academe, with professional competence being placed ahead of administrative control and other types of ministry (pastoral counselling, inner-city educational projects, and the like) ahead of the more traditional roles of institutional education.

On the other hand, at the institutional level, there is the natural development and evaluation of the educational institution in itself and especially in the self awareness of administrators, governing boards, faculty and students; oftentimes this progress is slowed, or made uncomfortable, by the slower evolution of alumni, friends, and public supporters. One aspect of this growth is the increased awareness of the role of the governing board (I speak particularly of Catholic institutions, but the phenomenon

is probably ecumenical!) as servants and stewards of a public trust. Rejecting a more simplistic view that linked church and college more tightly than the facts would now appear to have warranted, these institutions do not so much decide to go secular (or perhaps become merely Christian, or Church-related, from parochial to employ Dr. Cole's four-fold division), they *recognize* with growing clarity that they have long been such, by the acceptance of a civil charter and public support.

Secondly, I believe we ought to note the evolution even of the theological dimensions of Christian education. This trend is especially noticeable in the increased emphasis on the specific roles and values of the pastoral approach (counselling, confessional instruction, apologetics, and worship) as distinguished from the more scientific, literary, philosophical, and generally academic stance more appropriate to the classroom and lecture hall. Whereas the former once held pride of place in Church-related schools and then clashed with the latter when the shift was in full course, it has now yielded the podium to the strictly academic and enjoys renewed prominence beside the campus, where the chaplain's new role has become established.

This conscious shift of emphasis evolved gradually for some time, but rapidly the last explosive decades. It can be noted in older faculty and administration, both clerical and lay, but it is more pronounced in the younger generation of faculty members, partly because of their broadened previous experience (in the secular graduate schools) and partly because they have rethought the relative values of preaching (propagandizing) and of giving witness (as a Christian professional, sometimes as a hyphenated minister!).

A third, and final, area in which distinctions are, I believe, necessary and attention warranted is that of the legal and corporate disentanglement of the institutional and religious structures. This is an interesting development in Catholic (and especially Jesuit) colleges and universities in America.

In this connection, the first aspect of note is the evolution of the mind-set of the religious group, from the "own and operate" mentality to that of the management of a "public trust." The manifold consequences of this change of outlook have

included a necessary rethinking of governmental and economic structures in the Catholic college.

The former mode ("own and operate"), which has now disappeared from many of the larger (Catholic) institutions saw ecclesial and academic administrations identified in the same persons, and usually entailed a unified system of accounts and ownership, whereby the property of the sponsoring church or order was merged with that of the institution. The latter usually survived its financial crises by reason of the contributed services of the faculty. The religious or clerical faculty members received only support, and the difference between their support and their hypothetical "book" salary was their "contributed service;" without this financial contribution and often a corresponding one by low-paid lay faculty, many institutions would not have survived to this day. I am sure that, at the corresponding points in the evolution of Protestant colleges, similar contributions must have been of critical importance.

This mingling, however, of the properties belonging to sponsoring groups and to the institution is neither tidy nor prudent in days of shrinking or aging religious manpower and of rising costs. In Jesuit institutions, at least, to speak about that with which I am familiar, and I realize that all schools have met this challenge in the past, the trend is rapid towards a clearer separation of accounts, support, and control.

Sometimes this separation takes the form of "separate incorporation," or "dual incorporation," or "community incorporation," wherein the religious community is established legally and financially as a charitable corporation under civil charter, separate from that of the institution. Formerly merged accounts are separate, salaries for the religious are paid to the community, which in turn pays to the college for its use of college property and services. An explicit gift, corresponding to the "contributed service" is made by the religious community to the institution, retaining its role as a living endowment.

Motivations for this development, in Jesuit schools at least, is quite varied, stretching from the desire to be free for more pressing pastoral obligations to a resolve to improve the direction of the educational institution, by broadening the responsibility

and membership of its governing board. The aim is not necessarily to abandon any institution (indeed it does not necessarily mean any lessening of religious membership on the institutional board, although this is most often the case), nor is it merely protective of the financial status of the community (for instance, to ensure pension or retirement support in communities which have a growing proportion of the elderly, ill, and retired), although all these motives have some weight. Other chains of reasoning place weight upon this separation of structures as a way of freeing the institution for new directions and experiments, which might not easily win ecclesiastical approval, and as a means of protecting the religious community from undeserved backlash arising out of institutional misadventures.

In conclusion, it must be admitted that very many elements of church-related education are in flux today, particularly in Catholic and Jesuit circles. The situation is hardly less confusing to the religious themselves than it is to the general public. Perhaps it will help to keep distinct the levels of theological and institutional change, as we strive to sort out the evolving relationship between church and college. Father McGrath's paper on separate incorporation, to which Dr. Kelly refers, was indeed a helpful clarification of this relation, but it neither is nor should be interpreted as an obliteration of Church-relatedness. New modes of witness and service are very much called for, and America needs a religious voice in education, as it needs the freedom, in some institutions at least, to give appropriate attention to all areas of religious thought and their implications in human life.

# Neo Monachism: A Coming Role for Church-Related Higher Education

**Wesley A. Hotchkiss**

I would like to propose for our edification and delight that the coming role of the church-related undergraduate college of the liberal arts and sciences will be essentially monastic. I offer this not as a despairing relegation of the church college to irrelevant oblivion, but as a great aspiring hope for a new, desperately needed form of higher education for our time. Perhaps I am needlessly shouldering the weight of a discredited symbol, but I know of no other symbol to express the desperation I feel for a new definition of higher education. I am proposing this in great seriousness and urgency.

If the monastic symbol is a bit ponderous for this purpose, let us try to extract the germinal concept and reinvest it in contemporary times. At its best, the monastic movement, at least in its cenobitic forms, was the effort of an intentional community to seclude itself from temporal concerns in order to devote itself to religion. This was a rather drastic response to overwhelming and pervasive forces in the general social situation. The present role of the church-related undergraduate college of the liberal arts and sciences is in a disturbingly similar situation with respect to the technological society in general and to the educational establishment in particular. The college may be compelled toward a form of neo-monachism if it is to pursue seriously its historically proclaimed goals of liberal education. For anyone seriously to propose such a role, there must be a rather gloomy evaluation of the state of the general society. I admit to being basically gloomy as I contemplate the erosion of the essential spirit of man under the depredations of unlimited and continual technological progress.

I have plenty of distinguished company in my gloomy analysis of the predicament of modern man. The late Paul Tillich said it in one much-quoted reference to "the self-sufficient finitude." Others have elaborated his analysis with volumes of perceptive data. Jaques Ellul, the French lawyer, uses the word

"technique" to describe this autonomous value system which rolls along "according to a process which is causal but not directed to ends." He goes on to say,

> "Modern man's state of mind is completely dominated by technical values and his goals are represented only by such progress and happiness as is to be achieved through techniques."

The power of our technology is symbolized in The Bomb, but this is the eternalized and dramatically visible kind of technical power. The more subtle kind of power is the total domination over the mind and spirit of man in which our human freedom as spontaneous, creative, unorthodox, unique individuals disappears. As Ellul says: "When power becomes absolute, values disappear."

This is dramatically illustrated whenever I talk to my neighbors on Long Island who are the systems engineers for Grumman. They put two men on the moon by organizing thousands of human beings into systems in which the men and the machines are indistinguishable. These men have been spiritually captured to the extent that they really believe these systems can solve any problem presented to them, and they probably can. As Apollo 12 was streaking toward another moon landing, the *Wall Street Journal* reported on the bitter struggle inside NASA between the engineers and the scientists. The engineers had so totally committed themselves to the techniques of getting there and back that they could not understand those scientists who think the purpose of going there was to extend knowledge. For the engineers, the systems are ends in themselves. The power of technique is absolute, but its values have disappeared. We have the illusion that we can direct our technique toward selected ends and purposes, but actually the process itself is causal and the values have disappeared.

The contemporary university is the heart (or should we say the computer center) of "the self-sufficient finitude." Among the recognized leaders of the established universities there is a consensus expressed by former President Perkins of Cornell in the opening sentences of his book, *The University in Transition:*

> The university has become one of the great institutions of the modern world. In the United States it is central in the conduct of our national life. It is the most sophisticated agency we have for advancing

> knowledge through scholarship and research. It is crucial in the transmittal of knowledge from one generation to the next. And it is increasingly vital in the application of knowledge to the problems of modern society.

This statement by James Perkins is one of the most humane I have found as a rationale for the modern university, but its assumptions are that the university is a sophisticated agency to serve the self-sufficient technology. Clark Kerr's definitive work, *The Uses of the Multiversity,* reflects the same rationale and the title of his book says it all. It cannot go unnoticed that both of these men, the ablest protagonists the universities have, are casualties of the student revolt.

One of the most noteworthy ironies of our turbulent times is the question of the relevance of the university, and I think this helps to sharpen the dilemma. The situations in which the student revolts have been most effective in bringing these massive systems to a grinding halt have been those in which the students have gathered around the irrelevance of the university. The irony here is that the university has become, in Perkins' words, "one of the great institutions of the modern world" precisely because it has proven itself to be the most relevant system ever devised for the technological society. It is the relevance, the soul destroying, efficient, totally rational relevance of the university that has brought it into mortal struggle with the "new generation"; those people of all ages whom Daniel Bell classifies as having an apocalyptic rather than a technocratic orientation toward the future. It is the relevance of this "sophisticated agency for advancing knowledge through scholarship and research" that makes it a threat to our humanity as spontaneous, valuing persons; and it is at this point that it is being challenged.

The challenge is in the form of an anti-rational revolt, a revolt against the assumption that all of reality can be perceived as *objects*–including man himself–which can be "understood" and therefore manipulated. The whole message and life-style of the apocalyptic generation is directed against these "uses of the multiversity" by the self-sufficient finitude of our technology. It is at this point that the university gets tense and defensive because it knows that its lifeline to the technology is being threatened.

What is involved here is no mere student revolt but a proteon clash of cosmic proportions over the soul of our society.

It is at this point that the cruelest irony of all appears when that great intellectual, Spiro Agnew, emerged from the citadel of our technology to defend the university from the effete snobbery of the long-haired barbarians. If I were a university president, I would be more offended by Agnew's friendship than by Abbie Hoffman's enmity. I can visualize that great Armageddon for the university with Reagan and Agnew standing back to back defending its parapets; and that is irony honed to its finest edge!

But the university is expendable. If it appears that the effete, long-haired snobs may actually interfere with the university's total relevance to the self-sufficient finitude, then the university may have to go. The centrifugal forces of more and more complex specialization in the university are preparing the way for its dismantling and transferring to the technology. As the university gets more specialized, its specialties get more independent and autonomous, with the heads of departments making their own contracts with the military-industrial-government complex, preparing the way for the dismantling of the university. This will be the form of "external integration" of the university's functions which James Perkins described in the collection of essays edited by Logan Wilson and published in 1965 as *Emerging Patterns in Higher Education.*

Fortunately, the technology is ready for this eventuality. The great industrial giants already have their "universities" in such places as Sterling Forest, the Research Triangle, Brookhaven, and others. If the apocalyptic generation really threatens to interfere with the "uses of the multiversity," it would be a simple matter to transfer the function directly to the military-industrial complex where "scholarship and research and the transmittal of knowledge" could proceed without the interruptions of the apocalyptic generation. I think this is a very real possibility and, at the modern rate of social change, it could be accomplished within President Nixon's administration.

Most of the analyses of the "university trouble" I have read continue to search for new techniques of organizing and administering and governing the university, as though we could keep

the university from flying apart if we could just improve the system. Few of the analyses confront with honesty the magnitude and depth of the conflict between the "uses of the multiversity" and the value system of the new generation.

This is the social, economic, and political context within which I propose a neo-monastic role for the church-related college. The university is expendable if its atavistic remnants of a value system get in the way of its technological relevance.

Of course, we would be naive if we did not assess accurately the tenacity of such an enormous bureaucracy as the university systems. When challenged, they will demonstrate an extraordinary will to survive. The first erosion will be in the physical sciences which have their most immediate relevance to the self-sufficient finitude. The university will go more heavily into the behavioral sciences, and it will demonstrate its relevance in these disciplines by going more to psycho-social techniques which also are among the "uses of the multiversity." But this adaptation on the part of the university will further enhance the new monachism of the private college of general education.

If I have sufficiently described the Orwellian horror, let us turn to a description of the lineaments of the neo-monachism in higher education. First, let me say that if I have overemphasized the gloom of the present situation, I have done it as a Christian. It is out of this context that the theology of hope arises. It is only in the anguish of our "sickness unto death" that the Great Physician arrives with healing in His wings. Let us consider the outlines of this form of education from the standpoint of an adaptation of the classical definition of monachism: "secluded from temporal concerns and devoted to religion."

The "seclusion" of the church-related college will be more spiritual than physical. Given the overpowering dominance of technique, some form of secluded sheltering of the spirit and intellect is necessary. If the university has succumbed to the dominance of technique, as I believe it has, then the college of humane learning must necessarily find ways of secluding itself in a wholly different style of life. Here we must draw a distinction

between seclusion and isolation. The seclusion of the college in order to devote itself to a radically distinguished educational experience does not mean isolation from the self-sufficient finitude. Rather it means a spiritual seclusion in order to confront the technology more skillfully and cogently with the values which it hopes to ignore. It could be a seclusion in order to prepare people to participate in the technology and survive as free spirits. It would be an educational experience in self-awareness that would prepare a person even for a career in the military-industrial complex. In this sense it would be in the highest tradition of thirteenth-century monachism. The objective would be to provide young people with survival skills, or in the words of Henry David Aiken: "In a world in which all moorings have been washed away, what the student needs nowadays is not an anchor, for which he no longer has any use, but a pair of compasses, a strong keel, and a first rate set of pumps."

The symbolism of the campus needs to be revived as the place where an embattled force prepares itself for the conflict against the barbarism of a value-less technology. At a time when the newest forms of higher education are becoming indistinguishable in the metropolis (as, for example, some architectural concepts for new community colleges), the architectural symbol of the campus is becoming increasingly meaningful for this form of education. We may have abandoned the ivory tower prematurely in our scramble to be useful to the technology.

This educational neo-monachism would have a purpose diametrically opposite to the assumptions underlying the "uses of the multiversity." If the dominant characteristic of the university is to make itself useful to the self-sufficient finitude, then the purpose of the neo-monachism would be to organize an educational experience around those values, external to the technology, which form the basis of man's freedom as an intuitive, spontaneous, creating, valuing creature. There would be only one subject in such a curriculum and that would be the Self, and all the disciplines of learning would become the context in which the secluded community would attempt to understand the ultimate concerns of human existence. This is what is meant by religion, or, more accurately, "the religious." To see each of the disciplines as contexts for considering the ultimate concerns of

human existence would be to place values and valuing at the center of the educational process. This, it seems to me, should be the distinguishing character of the church-related college.

This has not been the distinguishing feature of the church college. It is possible to have all the marks of visible piety overlaid on an educational method and curriculum which have been just as totally subverted by technology as the public university. It is even possible to include religion as a subject without disturbing the rational autonomy of those educational systems committed to techniques. This is religion in the interests of public service and research.

We must observe also that it is not only some church-related colleges which are attempting to turn toward an educational concept based on the ultimate concerns of human existence. Some of the most noteworthy innovations are in private colleges having no formal church relationships.

The monachism necessary for the development of this concept of education is necessary not only as protection against the omnipresent technology, but as a protection against the standardized and autonomous educational system designed to serve it. In order to gain the freedom it needs, the college needs seclusion from educators as well as from engineers.

The vestigial organizations of church colleges are likely to be more and more irrelevant because they are based on a category—that is, "church-related"—which is no longer meaningful. "Church-related" as a category no longer can serve to distinguish any set of educational institutions. On the other hand, an organization of undergraduate colleges committed to the educational implications of "the religious," as above defined, would be a meaningful category with which to characterize a group of educational institutions. This common characteristic appears to me to provide the only viable basis upon which a new relationship to the church can proceed; in effect, a new monastic order.

Obviously, the presentation of an educational ideal such as outlined here must be rhetorical and polemical. The operational

question is the difficult question. How shall this idea become incarnate in an educational institution? The difficulty is that there is no single form or method uniquely expressive of the idea. No one can point to any of the new innovative shapes of higher education now emerging and say with confidence, This is it! Neither can we be sure that established traditional colleges are totally incapable of turning more and more toward the ultimate concerns of human existence as their primary educational commitments. It is the fragility of the idea as it finds form and content which makes it so vulnerable to the omnipotent technology. This is the reason for the new monastic imperative.

The essential commitment is to the process of maturing self-awareness. Each discipline must be presented as a part of that process. This is the opposite of the presentation of the disciplines as bodies of objective data, as techniques for knowing and manipulating. Education in self-awareness would face the opposite direction—toward the aesthetic dimension. The data must not only be known, they must be appreciated and loved before they can be a part of the process of maturing self-awareness. Instead of being objective, education must be subjective.

An educational experience of this kind can be arranged only by selecting a group of scholars and teachers and administrators who believe in it passionately and are willing to run the professional and vocational risks necessary to the projection of this kind of institution.

The difficulty of projecting this kind of educational experience is great in each of the disciplines, but perhaps some of the philosophical difficulties are more immediately apparent in those disciplines most essential to the autonomous technological society; namely, the sciences. A little deeper inquiry, of course, will show that any discipline can be presented either way, but the sciences are most identified with a body of empirically derived data. How can the sciences as disciplines be turned around to provide a context for maturing self-awareness? The first answer is that scientific inquiry must first be based on a process of valuing. Truth, in this sense, is a human value to be loved passionately, not a body of data once-for-all delivered. Awareness and appreciation of the world around us comes through valuing the truth about the world.

For example, my academic discipline is geography, much neglected in general education but highly useful to the self-sufficient technology. When I finished graduate school twenty years ago, I was eager to put my discipline to use either in one of the many branches of regional and urban planning or in teaching. At that time I would have used or taught geography as an earth science. If I were to teach geography today, I would treat it as aesthetics. In general education, geography is earth appreciation and it should be presented as a process of self-awareness just as music appreciation or art appreciation. It is not enough to know *about* the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven, one must learn to *experience* the Ninth Symphony. Similarly, it is not enough to know *about* the earth. *One must experience the earth and value it passionately.* Indeed, experiencing the earth is the first step into valuing all the physical and biological sciences, and to their internalizing into a process of self-awareness. This is the pedagogical reason why, at Prescott College in Arizona, the freshman orientation is an extensive training for a wilderness experience, part of it in solitude.

This aesthetic dimension of the sciences is the only real hope of unifying and integrating a curriculum. There is no hope of integrating disparate bodies of data which are functioning under their own autonomous laws of the Technique. No amount of "interdisciplinary courses" can hold these data together. They can only be brought together by turning them around to face each other through their common aesthetic dimension. If they are turned around, all their forces are centrepetal, in self-awareness, and they cannot be separated.

The subversion of the behavioral sciences and the humanities away from the purposes of self-awareness has been more subtle than in the physical sciences but none the less real. They too must be centered around their aesthetic dimensions before they can be a valid part of this self-educative process.

What we are describing is the educative opposite of the self-sufficient finitude. This is really "the religious" in education, and this is where the church-related college should distinguish itself. I see no other possible distinction. Organization of colleges around this idea of education would be most useful both for protection of the new monachism and for mutually supportive appreciation.

## Commentary

**Harold H. Viehman**

I was apprehensive as Sam invited me to respond to a paper that Dr. Hotchkiss was to prepare. Generally, over many years now, I have found that we have shared common convictions, and resulting common involvements in higher education. Wes and I, if anything, have found too little to argue about.

As I read his paper, I found once again that Dr. Hotchkiss had contributed to my thought, stretching imagination and vision, to embrace a new view of the church-related college or university. But this time, I think he's gone a bit too far and so I want to challenge him and seek modification at a number of points.

As respondent I've been constrained to ask:

1. Do I really agree with the analysis presented in the first five or six pages?
2. Do I really believe he has offered any reasonable and useful suggestions to meet the situation he describes by his analysis? Has he described the useful church and college relation?

I make my comments with these questions in mind.

I'm grateful for the sharp focus Wes gives to the seeming inexorable pressures of the technological on our society, and especially upon our colleges and universities. I, too, speculated–that, once the processes were set in motion, we undoubtedly would have had our two moon shots even if the country at the time had been invaded by some alien forces! Such seems to be the inexorable quality of the technical, set amidst riots, hunger, and conflicts of infinite variety.

But I confess I'm also impressed with the systems developments that combine human skill and capacity in such exacting designs, as to make precision moon landing possible, and I'm eager to explore their possible uses as models for services for human welfare and dignity.

While I'm aware of the dangers which lead to the gloom of Dr. Hotchkiss' paper, I want to press for the necessity of working *in and through the new systems, seeking to redeem them from dehumanizing mechanistic characteristics*–rather than abandon

them to their own ends by a system of planned withdrawal. I don't want to argue with what Dr. Hotchkiss wants to do, but with the *way* he wants to do it.

I'm encouraged in this direction by what I believe I see in the contending student to whom Dr. Hotchkiss points. They, too, as he points out, are reacting and are recognizing the limits of the purely rational. I also believe that they are sufficiently vocal to begin to bring their concerns to the top of the societal agenda. I believe this is coming faster than we recognize in a society which is increasingly political, as Dr. Kelley pointed out, and in which it will soon be difficult to outvote the rising generation. Furthermore, they are the manpower source really needed by the technological system!

Dr. Hotchkiss and I are agreed that there are discernible forms of a new value system emerging, and, as he says, it is probably on the fringes of our higher education enterprise. With this I also agree.

When he continues–"but it (the new value system) is there in such fragile form that it needs the shelter of a monastery,"–we disagree.

I'm simply firmly convinced that his method is not a live option for our day. I'm convinced that the character of our interdependent society, and especially the necessity for arriving at new ways of extending our ethical insights to include new corporate structures–requires that our new value system be born, and grow its own essential character, in the midst of the maelstrom. What we need cannot, in my judgment, be developed in the neo-monastic style which Dr. Hotchkiss suggests. The struggle to place value and valuing at the center of the educational process must be carried on with the technologists and all their allies in the middle of our contemporary world–and primarily by those who are now in the colleges and universities and related to the technical processes.

And, I will add rather quickly, aided and abetted by the churches!

Let me add to this affirmation, and in doing so, try to deal further with our theme–patterns of church and college relations.

In our discussions throughout this day, I've been in full agreement with those who see our problem as definition: 1) of church; 2) of college; and 3) of relation. I've tried to suggest that I believe we are at one of those historic moments where all the inherited images of the church as an institution established in power in our society are *useless.*

The church has been so truly dis-established in our lifetimes–(though the process began over 500 years ago) that we cannot use the accustomed ways of thinking about the church, the clergy or the Christian style of life. I firmly believe that our situation is much more analogous to that of the first three centuries before the Constantinian embrace, than to anything that has existed since that time. We must learn to rethink our life and our role as churchmen in terms of patterns of influence, and not patterns of power, in terms of useful and carefully planned service, and not prestige or status of any kind.

Such a church cannot be the *proprietor* for any major or even minor institutions of our society and culture, including schools and colleges. But such a church might well be of *exceptional service and usefulness,* as supportive ally of all types of higher education, public, private and some which should continue to be known as "church-related." And, the concern of the church should be *broad enough* to encompass all the growing variety of institutional forms by which men are and will be educated.

The commitment should be *deep enough* to provide the disciplined persons capable of making the necessary contribution. This requires preparation and skills that we have not really required of the major servants of the church. It requires research and preparation in which the church has not seen fit to engage until now.

It is one of the ironies of the age that our youth think the church is irrelevant at precisely that moment when these same students are raising the issues to which our faith and heritage speaks most clearly. Our problem in the church is not irrelevance, it is *incompetence,* an inability to think and speak clearly in social ethical terms to the complex world we've created. We are strong in pontificating. We can make moralistic pronouncements on most any problem, without any basic understanding of the problem or the steps to any honest solutions. The world is not

waiting for one more pronouncement. These do not illumine the real situation, and the world acknowledges in the church no meaningful authority.

I believe the world is hungry for disciplined persons, ready to live seriously, insightfully, imaginatively into the complex human situations, and will not stand off from any church participation professed in this way.

I say the church must enter upon this wherever men are being educated. But what about the possibilities and need to accomplish this through church-related colleges or universities? In this regard let me try one more definition of what I believe to be an answer to the claims to uniqueness so bantered about today.

I do not believe that church-related institutions are "unique," or should seek to be "unique." I learned from Liston Pope at Yale that one should always seek to uncover the *configuration* by which various factors are related in any given institutional or social situation. One does not seek merely to enumerate all factors, or seek the dominant ones, but to study how they interrelate. What is the pattern, and what change of one or two factors in that pattern might alter, radically, the whole situation?

With this way of thinking, I then turn to the "theology of the race track," and suggest that all I can claim for the church-related institution is better odds–a greater likelihood that the configuration of forces might be made to serve ends consistent with the public good as understood and informed by the value insights of the Christian tradition.

I relate to forty-six United Presbyterian colleges and universities. Each must be understood in terms of: location, history, dominant leadership past and present, student constituency, faculty constituency, financing constituency, and the good and ill found in church relation, past and present. What is possible and likely depends on the configuration of these and more. Church relationship is important, but only as one of the determining configurative factors.

My real *options* for working with those institutions which are church-related are simply different, and in most instances filled with greater possibilities than in working with public universities. Consequently, the relations of the church are of a

different essence. But, they are not fixed or static. Therefore, for me to treat them normatively or definitively is to misunderstand both the role of the church and the nature of the college.

I believe the church must seek to relate to colleges and universities to increase numbers of persons capable of dealing sensitively and in an informed way with our society. The church must understand that in every possible way it must continue to help colleges and universities to carry forward this function for the good of mankind. It must establish new patterns far less formal and ceremonial, for doing this in its own related colleges. It must do this as it is able in all education. The relation should be understood in functional rather than formal terms and must be multiform. It focuses upon fixing the valuing function in the midst of the higher educational enterprise, as Dr. Hotchkiss recommends. It utilizes every option it has for doing this in public education. It utilizes some greater options for doing this in church-related colleges and universities. But, it seeks to help all education fulfill this function in the midst of the maelstrom we call contemporary society and avoids the temptations to withdrawal.

## Summary Statement

**Alfred F. Horrigan**

During the past several years there have been recurring discussions in the meetings of the Commission on Religion in Higher Education of the need of a conference dealing with the contribution of church-related higher education to the public good. The underlying theme of these discussions was that, while there have been a variety of studies, conferences, and reports concerning the value, needs, and future prospects of church-related higher education, most of them have approached the topic from the viewpoint of the colleges themselves or the sponsoring churches.

It was felt that there had been inadequate attention to the role of the church-related college precisely from the viewpoint of the public good. The question that needed further exploration in depth, it was suggested, was, "What would be lost in terms of the public good if the programs of the church-related colleges were to be substantially reduced or even phased out altogether?" The Commission agreed that it would be eminently worthwhile to organize a conference with such a theme.

Accordingly, this conference was structured around four principal position papers. For the purposes of this report, I shall limit myself to a review of the broad themes of the position papers and the pattern of reactions which seemed to emerge.

The background paper for the conference, a historical review of American church-related education prepared by Dr. Charles E. Peterson, Jr., called "Whence Before Whither," was the subject of the first evening's discussion.

One of the most provocative themes of Dr. Peterson's paper is a comparison between the evolving philosophy of the United States Supreme Court and the evolving philosophy of American church-related higher education. He provides the following summary of his approach:

> I have attempted to say that the inner vision of the church-related college, like the inner vision of the Supreme Court, has been discerned more clearly in the evolutions of the colleges and universities under the control of the church than it has been through carefully worked out enunciations of principle. But there has been a vision, however ineptly articulated, which has guided men and institutions down to the

present time in higher education. Further, like the inner vision of the court about the future America, the vision of church-related higher education has been modified by design and by chance, by geography and by custom, by bigness of vision and by smallness of spirit in the lives of individuals. Through these modifications the vision has been adapted to the realities of our lives and to the wishes of the people, just as the court's vision has been and is being modified by daily events and by public acceptance and rejection. It matters little how ill-guided the modifications have been; the vision did bend and become flexible and living—and that is important.

It is important, too, that we not approach the discussion of "The Church-Related College and the Public Good" with a *mea culpa* complex born of the painful examination of the factors of our history as institutions. It is entirely possible that the church college and its parish counterpart could not have matured other than they did, evolving as they were as spiritual institutions in an increasingly materialistic society. It is entirely possible, I think, that the very modifications which we commonly think of as flaws in the vision of the church-related college hold the key to the future role of the institution in service to its world. The very responsiveness to local pressures hints at an institution which cares and which has the machinery to make care concrete. Its susceptibility to the thinking, even the pressures, of local personalities suggests that its strength lies in service to men in individual situations. Its penchant for piety and missionary commitment hints at its capacity for inspiring young people to lives of service to their world. Our historical flaws may reveal the secret of our future mission.

Not all of the conferees were equally disposed to accept the appropriateness of the Supreme Court analogy. Dr. Harry E. Smith, executive director, Society for Religion in Higher Education, expressed the misgiving that the church-related colleges generally throughout their history have failed to give "substantive meaning" to their own inner vision, and have not been successful in defining the distinctive contributions which they believe that they do or should make to the public good.

Dr. Charles E. Ford, director of the Center for Christian Higher Education, submitted that the usefulness of the historical approach to the conference theme is severely limited by the lack of adequate studies on developments within church higher education in this century, particularly since 1941.

Dr. Philip Gleason, associate professor of history at the University of Notre Dame, pointed out that another serious

problem in coming to grips with the conference theme from a historical point of view is that the concept of the "public good" in the nineteenth century included religious values and interests, and that it does not do so today.

In the second paper, presented by Dr. Joseph P. Kelly under the title, "Secularization–Public Trust: The Development of Catholic Higher Education," a natural evolution from the original closely held denominational institution, usually Protestant, to its modern progeny, the private, independent college and university is traced. He finds a similar contemporary development in Catholic colleges and universities, but points out that, in view of well-known tensions and revolutionary trends of the present period in both church and civil society, there is no blessed anonymity for Catholic institutions and religious orders as they make the public transition to secularity.

Dr. Kelly contends that "Catholic schools have become public trusts that should reflect the interest, needs, and desires of a much broader spectrum of people." He identifies himself with the school of thought that maintains that it is the general public that really owns the assets of church-related institutions. His main thesis is that church-related colleges are public-private institutions–public in charters, goals, purposes, governance, faculty, student, and administration recruitment, and in requests for public support which are based upon their service to society.

For Dr. Kelly, the above concept of the modern church-related college is the working definition of "secularization." In his view, it does not mean a lessening of religious commitment. He insists that the word "secular" in this context should be given an altogether positive meaning, and that, for example, secularization could make a college more rather than less Catholic.

The respondents to Dr. Kelly's paper suggested the need for more far-ranging studies on contemporary Catholic versions of church-related higher education in terms of the evolving concept of the Church proposed by Vatican II's Constitution on the Church and in other subsequent studies.

The third position paper, "The Church-Related College in American Society," prepared by Dr. Charles C. McCoy, addressed itself directly to the question: "What will be lost to American

society and the churches if church-related colleges sever their denominational ties?" In approaching this topic Dr. McCoy offers an extremely provocative disclaimer:

> Additional misunderstanding arises from the quest for some unique function which only church-related colleges can perform because of the Christian faith which informs their life. The search for uniqueness is probably pursuing a will o' the wisp, certainly is questionable on educational grounds, and appears to me as a perversion of Christian faith. This quest must be discarded before it is possible to see the contribution of church-related colleges which we can ill afford to lose.

He continues:

> These contributions are of this kind: as a countervailing power to the present perils of state domination of educational media; to provide alternatives to the tendencies toward isomorphism; to take innovative action in areas of human need; to develop cooperative ventures among colleges which will contribute to the ecumenical movement and to wider inter-religious understanding; and to serve as resource centers for the improvement of institutonal church policies.
>
> Church-related colleges can, I am convinced, contribute to a richer mix of diversity and function in American higher education. But there is no guarantee that all colleges sponsored by churches are capable of meeting these challenges. . . . I offer no blanket endorsement of church-related institutions. If they will engage in rethinking of their roles at the most basic level of commitment, purpose, and social context, church-related colleges can move toward new self-understandings which will continue to make them too important to lose.

He concludes:

> Probably the greatest loss, if the ties between college and church were severed, would be sustained by the churches. But this loss to the churches would also be detrimental to American society. To put it another way, one of the most important contributions which church-related colleges make to society is indirectly through the churches by which they are sponsored. Quite clearly, this indirect contribution of higher education to society through the churches is and can be made also by public colleges and universities, but the closer the relation, provided it is not one of control on one side or the other, the greater the possibilities of usefulness.

In the discussion on Dr. McCoy's paper there was agreement that he had raised a point of exceptional importance in challenging the current preoccupation of many church-related colleges to justify their mission in terms of a certain uniqueness. Unquestionably there are certain semantic hang-ups surrounding the issue.

It seems clear, however, there is a substantial problem which deserves top-priority consideration in continuing exploration of the role of church-related colleges.

Dr. McCoy's paper also produced a stimulating discussion on the topic of the church-related college's responsibility for promoting "social change." Dr. Gleason, of Notre Dame, warned of the danger of a "new moralism" which consists of little more than a denunciation of "wicked people." This type of moralism begins with the premise that "we" have "the answers" to the great social and moral challenges of our time if we can just persuade other people to accept them.

The final position paper, written by Dr. Wesley Hotchkiss, presented the challenging thesis that the future role of the church-related college should be essentially neo-monastic. His contention derived from a concern about the anti-human forces that are threatening to dominate our contemporary culture. His vision of neo-monachism calls not for isolation, but for seclusion. He asks for a new type of church-related education which must be devoted to the ultimate concerns of human existence and which seeks a maturing self-awareness. He speaks of the aesthetic experience of the sciences. He envisions a culmination in qualitative education which is necessary not only for the public good but for public survival. All these things he sees as the "educative opposite of the self-sufficient finitude." For Dr. Hotchkiss, this is ultimately "the religious" in education.

The discussion of Dr. Hotchkiss' paper developed a criticism of his thesis as intellectual romanticism which was countered in turn by his own insistence that what he was pleading for was really a higher intellectualism. A variety of points were made which turn on the issue as to whether academic redemption on the contemporary scene was to be found through seclusion or by working in and through existing systems.

In perspective it is doubtful whether many of the participants in the Wingspread Conference judged that even a broad consensus had been reached concerning the contribution of the church-related college to the common good. Most probably found it instructive that the context and the preoccupations of church-related higher education today are such that it was

difficult persistently to focus on the announced conference theme. Provocative questions were asked, and, if few definitive new answers were proposed, at least there was the feeling that new lights had been turned on down the avenues of inquiry. Certainly the conference provided for the participants sharpened motivations for addressing themselves to the ultimate issues upon which the future of American church-related higher education depends. Final judgment, of course, must rest with what I hope will be the very considerable number of persons who will read and reflect upon the published proceedings of the conference.

# Conference Participants

Bernard H. Boyd
James A. Gray Professor of Biblical Literature
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Gary Buerstatte
Student
Carroll College
Waukesha, Wisconsin 53186

William G. Cole, President
Chicago Council on Foreign Relations
116 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Harry R. Davis
Professor of Government
Beloit College
Beloit, Wisconsin 53511

Robert A. DeLeon
Student
Morehouse College
635 Fair Street, S.W., Apt. 210
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Mrs. John W. Deming
Trustee, Mary Baldwin College
2804 George's Lane
Alexandria, Louisiana 71301

John B. Evans
Secretary, Division of Higher Education
Presbyterian Church in the United States
Richmond, Virginia 23209

Charles E. Ford
Director, Center for Christian Higher Education
3701 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Clarence W. Friedman
Executive Secretary
National Catholic Educational Association
Suite 770, One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

James Fritschel
Associate Professor of Music
Wartburg College
915 Harlington Place
Waverly, Iowa 50677

Philip Gehring
Professor of Music
Valparaiso University
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383

Philip Gleason
Associate Professor of History
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Sister Mary Griffin, B.V.M.
Professor of English
Mundelein College
1111 Pratt Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60626

The Honorable H. H. Grooms
Trustee, Samford University
United States District Judge
North District of Alabama
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

William G. Guindon, S.J.
Provincial
New England Province
Society of Jesus
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

Robert Hassenger
Department of Sociology
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46566

Robert J. Henle, S.J.
President, Georgetown University
37th and O Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Alfred F. Horrigan
President
Bellarmine-Ursuline College
Louisville, Kentucky 40205

Wesley A. Hotchkiss
General Secretary
Division of Higher Education
United Church of Christ
287 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10010

William W. Jellema
Executive Associate and Research Director
Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

H. Andrew Johnson, M.S., D.D.S.
Trustee, Fisk University
16506 Fernway Road
Shaker Heights, Ohio 44120

Joseph P. Kelly
Chief Administrative Officer and Vice President
Webster College
Webster Groves, Missouri 63119

Charles E. Kenney, M.M.
President, Maryknoll College
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

Harold H. Lentz
President
Carthage College
Kenosha, Wisconsin 53140

Sister Rosaire Lucassen
Academic Dean
Dominican College
Racine, Wisconsin 53402

Irvin E. Lunger
President
Transylvania College
Lexington, Kentucky 40508

Sister Anselm Mary Madden
President
Marylhurst College
Marylhurst, Oregon 97036

Samuel H. Magill
President, Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities
Suite 770, One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Charles S. McCoy
Professor of Religion in Higher Education
Pacific School of Religion
1789 Scenic Avenue
Berkeley, California 94720

Daniel B. McGee
Department of Religion
Baylor University
Waco, Texas 76703

Robert C. Meacham
Professor of Mathematics
Florida Presbyterian College
St. Petersburg, Florida 33733

William E. Merritt, Jr., Student
Moravian College
2256-A Aster Road
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18018

Paul Mininger
President
Goshen College
Goshen, Indiana 46526

Randall Minor
President
Shorter College
Rome, Georgia 30161

Frederic W. Ness
President
Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Hubert C. Noble
Executive Director
Department of Higher Education
National Council of the Churches
of Christ in the U.S.A.
475 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10027

Charles E. Peterson, Jr.
Associate Professor of Education
Ohio University
49 Ohio Avenue
Athens, Ohio 45701

Richard Peterson
Associate Executive Secretary
Board of College Education
Lutheran Church in America
231 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

William M. Shinto
Director of Christian Higher
Education Services
American Baptist Board of
Education
3128 Samoa Place
Costa Mesa, California 92626

Harry E. Smith
Executive Director
Society for Religion in
Higher Education
400 Prospect Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Robert L. Soulen
Professor of Chemistry
Southwestern University
Georgetown, Texas 78626

Samuel R. Spencer, Jr.
President
Davidson College
Davidson, North Carolina 28036

Donald Stanton
Associate Director
Department of Educational
Instruction
Division of Higher Education
United Methodist Church
Nashville, Tennessee 37202

Edwin Thompkins
Professor of Church History
Johnson C. Smith University
Charlotte, North Carolina 28208

Harold H. Viehman
Executive Secretary
Division of Higher Education
United Presbyterian Church
in the U.S.A.
825 Witherspoon Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Claude Welch, Chairman
Department of Religious Thought
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

B. Otto Wheeley
Trustee, Alderson-Broaddus College
Vice President, Manager of
Marketing
Koppers Company, Inc.
1301 Koppers Building
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Anne Whitehurst
Student
Randolph-Macon Woman's College
Lynchburg, Virginia 24504

Frank P. Zeidler
Trustee, Alverno College
2921 North Second Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53212

## THE JOHNSON FOUNDATION STAFF

Leslie Paffrath
President

George Goss
Senior Program Associate

Sister Rosita Uhen
Senior Program Associate
for Urban Affairs

Rita Goodman
Program Associate

Kenneth Kautzer
Administrative Assistant

Jayne Bogard
Program Assistant